SCOTTISH JOURNAL
of
THEOLOGY

Vol. 14, *No.* 4 *December* 1961

EDITORS:
REV. PROFESSOR T. F. TORRANCE
REV. PROFESSOR J. K. S. REID

OLIVER & BOYD LTD.
EDINBURGH: TWEEDDALE COURT
LONDON: 39A WELBECK STREET, W.1

SCOTTISH JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Published Quarterly

Editors:

Rev. Prof. T. F. Torrance, M.B.E., D.D., D.Theol.,
21 South Oswald Road, Edinburgh, 9 (Telephone NEW 6114)

Rev. Prof. J. K. S. Reid, D.D.,
90 St. Machar Drive, Aberdeen

Consulting Editors:

Very Rev. Principal J. H. S. Burleigh, D.D., B.Litt.
Chairman of Directors

Rev. Prof. David Cairns, D.D.

Rev. Prof. N. W. Porteous, D.D.

Rev. Prof. A. M. Hunter, Ph.D., D.Phil., D.D.

Directors:

The above-named together with

Rev. Prof. E. P. Dickie, M.C., D.D.

Rev. J. Heron, B.D., S.T.M.

Rev. Stewart Mechie, M.A., D.D.

Rev. T. M. Murchison, M.A.

Rev. J. A. McFadden, B.D.

Rev. J. W. Stevenson, M.A , D.D.

Rev. J. B. Torrance, B.D.

Rev. R. S. Wallace, M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D.

Rev. D. B. Thomson, M.A., M.Th., *Secretary*

CONTRIBUTIONS are invited from members of all branches of the Christian Church.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE—MSS and Books for review should be sent to one of the Editors.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE should be sent to the Registered Office.

PRICE: Six Shillings and Sixpence (U.S.A. and CANADA $1.00) per copy, post free.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: Twenty-four Shillings, post free. (U.S.A. and CANADA $4.00.)

PUBLISHED BY OLIVER AND BOYD FOR SCOTTISH JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY LTD.

Registered Office: TWEEDDALE COURT, EDINBURGH, 1

CONTENTS

PAGE

BIBLE AND BIBLICAL THEOLOGY IN THE EARLY REFORMATION, by Professor J. A. B. van den Brink, Leiden 337

NECESSARY BEING, by the Rev. Professor John H. Hick, M.A., D.Phil., Princeton 353

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, by Professor Otto Piper, D.D., Dr.Th., Princeton 370

LAYMANSHIP, by the Rev. John Mole, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Bradford 380

ARCHITECTURE AND LITURGY, by F. R. Stevenson, A.R.I.B.A., F.R.I.A.S., M.T.P.I., Edinburgh 390

THE PROBLEM OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW, by the Rev. Gabriel Hebert, D.D., S.S.M., Kelham 403

BOOK REVIEWS:

Frederick Ferré: *Language, Logic and God*, by the Rev. Professor D. L. Deegan, Portland 414

Max Scheler (tr. Bernard Noble): *On the Eternal in Man*, by the Rev. Dr James W. Leitch, Rotterdam 416

P. Vallotton: *Le Christ et La Foi*, by the Rev. Professor C. F. D. Moule, Cambridge 419

Edgar P. Dickie: *The Unchanging Gospel*, by the Rev. Dr Ronald Selby Wright, Edinburgh 422

Alan Richardson: *The Bible in the Age of Science*, by Clifford M. Jones, Leeds 423

Roy A. Stewart: *Rabbinic Theology*, by Alan D. Lowe, Leeds 424

James Hardy Ropes: *The Synoptic Gospels*, by the Rev. Dr A. J. B. Higgins, Leeds 425

Clinton D. Morrison: *The Powers That Be*, by the Rev. Dr A. J. B. Higgins, Leeds 426

Johannes Munck: *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, by Professor F. F. Bruce, Manchester 427

S. H. Hooke: *Alpha and Omega*, by the Rev. Dr R. McL. Wilson, St. Andrews 428

Virginia Corwin: *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*, by the Rev. Dr T. E. Pollard, Woollahra, N.S.W. 430

W. P. Le Saint (tr. and ed.): *Tertullian: Treatise on Penance*, by the Rev. Dr T. E. Pollard, Woollahra, N.S.W. 432

W. A. Bretherton: *The Ministry*, by the Rev. Dr A. K. Robertson, Langton, Duns 433

Basil Minchin: *Outward and Visible*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 434

Paul M. Harrison: *Authority and Power in the Free Church Tradition*, by Rev. Principal K. C. Dykes, Manchester 435

Clarence B. Bass: *Backgrounds to Dispensationalism*, by the Rev. Dr J. G. S. S. Thomson, Glasgow 436

Charles Grandison Finney (ed. W. G. McLaughlin): *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*, by the Rev. H. J. Hammerton, Leeds 439
Elizabeth G. K. Hewat: *Vision and Achievement 1796-1956: A History of the Foreign Missions of the Churches united in the Church of Scotland*, by the Rev. Kenneth MacKenzie, Edinburgh 440
Joachim Jeremias: *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries*; W.C.C. Commission on Faith and Order: *One Lord, One Baptism*, by J. R. C. Perkin, Altrincham 441
Max Thurian: *The Eucharistic Memorial*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 444
Jean Daniélou: *The Bible and the Liturgy*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 445
Books Received 447

IN THIS ISSUE

Articles on Reformation Biblical Theology
Necessary Being and God
Baptism
Church Architecture

The Biblical Study is on Matthew

Among the Reviews are works on
Christianity and Philosophy, analytical and phenomenological
the Divine Initiative in Christ
the Bible and Science
the Ministry
Religious Revivals
the History of Foreign Missions
Liturgy

BIBLE AND BIBLICAL THEOLOGY IN THE EARLY REFORMATION[1]

by PROFESSOR J. A. B. VAN DEN BRINK

EVERYWHERE in Europe the translations of the Bible into the vernacular languages have been the strongest help towards Reformation. It would be a very attractive task to study in detail, to compare and to summarise the history of the Bible in the Reformation movement, from West to East and from South to North in Europe.[2] John Knox tells us that, when the Act of Parliament of 1543 allowed the Scriptures to be read freely, this was 'no small comfort to such as before were held in such bondage that they durst not have read the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, nor articles of their faith, in the English tongue, but they should have been accused of heresy. Then might have been seen the Bible lying almost upon every gentleman's table. The NT was borne about in many men's hand.'[3] By these words is given no doubt a true and striking picture of the general situation in Scotland in those days and this may be true also for the beginnings of the Reformation in other countries some decades earlier. The Scots reformer adds that, although for reasons of profit many acted in an inexcusable way with the new book, 'yet thereby did the knowledge of God wondrously increase and God gave his Holy Spirit to simple men in great abundance'.

Now this is my first thesis: that the Bible in the early Reformation was passionately desired, not for the book as such, nor to have it as a weapon against the Church and its superfluous appendages, but as a help to find a better way to God. As such the Bible enriched the Christian people with a completely new self-reliance. As a striking illustration of this we may mention the attitude of the Earl of Argyll, Archibald Campbell. In March 1558 the Archbishop of St. Andrews, John Hamilton, sent him a letter to warn him against the troubles which might

[1] Delivered in the Universities of St. Andrews and Edinburgh, May 1960.

[2] The articles on *Bibelübersetzungen* in PRE[3] III, 1897, pp. 1-179, and RGG[3] I, 1957, c. 1201-19, are useful as recapitulation of materials.

[3] *John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland*, ed. by W. C. Dickinson (Edinburgh 1949), I, p. 45.

come about through his protection of John Douglas, whom he held preaching in his house. The self-conscious nobleman answered with the most admirable assurance that his chaplain 'preaches nothing to us than the Evangel. If he would otherwise do, we would not believe him, nor yet an angel of heaven. We hear him sow no schisms nor divisions, but such as man stand with God's Word. . . . Neither teaches he, neither we accept of him, but that which agrees with God's sincere Word, set forth by Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles and Evangelists, left to our salvation in his express Word.'[1] With a quiet and fully assured authority the Earl criticised the General Councils and asserted that he would be present personally if the Archbishop wished to hear his chaplain's confession before his tribunal. Thus the Earl of Argyll in no respect gave way to the authority of the hierarchy, rather than to the Bible itself; in matters of faith and Bible-interpretation he had found his own certitude, which he had no intention of giving up. It is the Bible which gives certitude and it is this certitude which makes man understand the Bible.

There is no simple reply to be given to the question what is first, the belief in the letter of the Bible, or faith which makes use of the Bible in the way it will be understood of itself. The promise of the Lords of the 'Common Band' of 1557 'to maintain, set forward, and establish the most blessed Word of God and his Congregation and to labour at our possibility to have faithful Ministers purely and truly to minister Christ's Evangel and Sacraments to his people', is fully on a level with it.[2] It is also on a level with Martin Luther's position, which he had formulated in a book of 1523, that a Christian congregation has the right and the power to judge doctrine, and to call and to dismiss ministers,[3] This was also Zwingli's conviction. 'If a man is called to preach by Christ, he is appointed as preacher by the *Gemeinde* which, in effect, has thus, full powers to choose and dismiss its preachers. While the preachers are in office, the message which they preach is to be tested by the *Gemeinde*, and any other preacher whose message does not conform to the proper standard is, of course, dismissed by the con-

[1] op. cit., II, App. IV, pp. 246-54.
[2] op cit., I, p. 136.
[3] W.A. II.401-16.

gregation.'[1] From a still more strictly theological point of view, it is also on a level with the fact that a good number of books, some of them directly destined for the people, look like a system of dogmatics, while being in reality rather a sum of the Bible, and vice versa. They all take the congregation seriously and by this practice bring about its emancipation. In this theory the Word of God 'is seated in the minds of the faithful'.[2] This is no theory of 'inner light', for the Word of God is fully respected in its heteronomous authority and identified with the Bible. Nevertheless the people know and possess it.

Patrick's Places may be considered as a fine illustration of this. In a well-known theological encyclopaedia of older date, it has been said that one of the articles of accusation against Patrick Hamilton in 1528 was his defence of the right of all people who had souls to read the Word of God, for they all were able to understand it well, especially the NT.[3] Although this cannot literally be found in *Patrick's Places*, his free use of Bible-text in his *Loci Communes* makes it almost certain that such was his opinion. Here are his own words in Dickinson's reproduction: '[xv] The faith of Christ is, to believe in Him; that is to believe his word . . . Thou wilt ask me: What word? I answer: The Gospel. [xvi] He that believeth God, believeth the Gospel. [Foxe: He that believeth the Gospel, believeth God.] He that believeth God, believeth his Word:—And the Gospel is his Word. Therefore he that believeth God, believeth his Gospel.'[4]

Hardly anything in those days was so incompatible with the interest and the claims of the Church and the clergy. There are two Dutch translations of *Patrick's Places*, entitled *Summa ende begrijp des menschen salicheyts*, 'the sum of man's salvation', printed apparently at Marburg, but in reality at Antwerp, in 1530 and perhaps 1540.[5] From the title it is clear that 'loci' and 'summa' had the same meaning in the opinion of the Dutch translator, or at least that he preferred the usage of the more

[1] R. F. Davies, *The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers* (The Epworth Press, 1946), p. 82.

[2] Zwingli, *De vera et falsa religione commentarius*, C.R. Zwingli, III, p. 752[22]; Davies, op. cit., p. 84 and note 2.

[3] PRE[3] VII, p. 387.

[4] Dickinson, II, App. I, p. 225.

[5] Nijhoff-Kronenberg, *Nederlandsche Bibliographie 1500-1540* (The Hague, 1919), n. 3140, 4239, cf. n. 3043.

traditional 'sum' to the—at that time—modern 'loci', as more suited to the theme 'man's salvation', which, in his opinion, was the essence of Patrick's argument; moreover there was—and is—no translation of 'loci' in Dutch which may give any better sense than 'places' in English. There is an English translation, entitled 'The *sum* of divinitie', 1548[1] of John Spangenberg's 'Margarita theologica continens praecipuos *locos* doctrinae christianae', 1540, which was an adaption of Melanchthon's 'Loci'. The preface of the Scots Confession of Faith, of 1560, too speaks of 'the sum of that doctrine which we profess'. The traditional connexion between, or rather the identification of the doctrinal and scriptural sense of the terms, has been introduced into the characteristically Protestant usage and way of thinking by Melanchthon, who declared in his *Loci Communes* that St. Paul had developed 'the most *common-places*' in his epistle to the Romans, which the Reformer considered as a '*doctrinae christianae compendium*'.[2] The rest has been done by his friend Spalatinus, who translated Melanchthon's *Loci* under the title of *Die hauptartickel und furnemesten punct der gantzen hayligen schrift*.[3] Martin Luther also considered certain Bible-texts 'locos communes odder gemeyne heubtstück des glaubens', which should be taught to children, 'auff das sie des glaubens und der schrifft gewaltig würden', in order that the 'pure doctrine' might not be so soon falsified. A charming simile is joined to these words by Luther: it is of no use to possess and to hear the Scripture copiously if we don't learn anything of it to our use, 'wie eine magd, die mitten yn blumen sösse, und keine wolt abbrechen ein krantz zu machen'.[4] 'Loci' and Bible-texts, doctrine and the Scriptures were identified by the early reformers as much as possible. And this is essentially the same as what is said in John Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* about *Patrick's Places*: 'The difference and repugnance of these aforesaid Places being well noted and expended, it shall give no small light to every faithful Christian, both to understand the *Scriptures*, to judge in cases of conscience, and to re-

[1] Pollard and Redgrave, *Short-title Catalogue* (1926), n. 23004.

[2] unicus Paulus hos locos palam ob oculos mortalium posuit; Melanchthon, *De studio doctrinae Pauli*, C.R. XI, c. 38; cf. P. Fraenkel, 'Revelation and Tradition', *Studia Theologica*, vol. XIII (Lund, 1959), p. 128 and note 128. R. Seeberg. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Erlangen-Leipzig, 1920[3]), IV, p. 421.

[3] C.R. XXII, c. 3, 4; cf. Joh. Kunze s.v. *Loci theologici*, PRE[3] XI, p. 571.

[4] W.A. 17.2. 319.

concile such places in the OT and NT as else men seem to repugn; according to the rule of St. Augustine, saying, "Distingue tempora, et conciliabis Scripturas" etc.' There are still other examples of this way of making theology in the early Reformation.

In 1524 William Farel, who twelve years later was to call John Calvin to Geneva, was an interim minister to the Duke of Montbéliard. In this situation he asked his friends at Basel for a popular text-book for the religious instruction of simple people. It seems that his friend Anémond de Coct sent him two books written in Latin: one by Luther, *De instituendis ministris ecclesiae* of 1523,[1] and another inexactly entitled *De instituendis pueris*, either by Zwingli or by Erasmus, as is supposed by Farel's modern biographers.[2] These books, however, were of no use for Farel's purposes and so he undertook to compile the kind of book he wanted himself. It is entitled: 'Summaire et briefve declaration daulcuns lieux fort necesaires a ung chascun chrestien pour mettre sa confiance en dieu et ayder son prochain. Jacques Chap. I' (v. 21b). It was issued at Basel in 1525 although the front page has Turin. It was very much in use, and was reprinted several times, enlarged by the author, even after he had himself abandoned the field for Calvin's 'Institution'. A unique copy of the first edition is in the British Museum.[3]

Farel always maintained, and was himself convinced, that his teachings of religion and of God's law were nothing but the pure contents of the Scripture. The authors of the new biography of Farel seem to criticise this claim and ask whether Farel's theology was an original creation issuing from his own Bible-study or rather the reflection of reformation-ideas circulating in his day.[4] Both are true, of course, but, be this as it may, it seems at any rate to be clear that Farel had a much greater interest in the practice of the Church than in doctrinal theories. Beside the Word of God, which he interpreted in a

[1] W.A. 12.169-96.

[2] *Guillaume Farel 1489-1565, biographie nouvelle écrite d'après les documents originaux par un groupe d'historiens* (Neuchâtel-Paris, 1930), pp. 39, 143 and note 2; the author of this section is J. Meyhoffer.

[3] Facsimile reprint by Arthur Piaget, Paris, 1935. Cf. J. Meyhoffer, *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme français*, vol. 78, 1929, pp. 361-70. Reprint of the edition of 1534 by J. G. Baum, Genève, 1867.

[4] *Biographie nouvelle*, pp. 27ff, 29, 143ff.

rather simple way, almost without raising great problems, he says in the chapter of his *Summaire* 'on the Spirit and the new man': 'all things are vanity and falsehood; it is much better to know this by experience than by a book' ('mieulx vaut beaucoup scavoir cecy par experience, que par livre'). Certainly he was as much impressed by Luther's writings as anybody had been in France since 1519, and he declined the illuminism or spiritualism of Karlstadt and his group. He desired nothing else than to teach a practical, but above all things biblically inspired Christianity, and he belongs to those reformers who found in Scripture, the exclusive authority for the whole of human life and thinking.[1] By Farel's writings and action as well as by many other reformers' work we are not seldom reminded of Tertullian's principle that 'discipline is the measuring-rod of doctrine'.[2]

In the preface to this attractive, although somewhat primitive *Summary*, which is generally considered his best book, Farel says: 'In these times, as it pleased our Lord to reveal the holy serenity and light upon those who were in very deep darkness . . .: listen all of you who do love the truth: do not stand by your own judgments, wisdom, reason and prudence, but by God whose intention is immutable.' Similar words have been said and written wherever the Reformation paved its way. Melanchthon, referring to humanistic studies, said that they had been restored by God's will in order that they might give some help to those who intended to purify the Church.[3] William Tyndale, in 'The prologge' of the first issue of his translation of St. Matthew's Gospel, before he quotes Luther's preface, declares it to be superfluous to avow the causes that moved him to translate the New Testament: 'for who is so blynde to axe [ask] why light shulde be shewed to them that walke to stomble [yn] the daunger of eternall damnacion', etc.[4] Everywhere we meet the same contrast in the same words: darkness, truth, light and purifying, and they were appropriate to the situation. Farel continues with a series of antitheses, such as the Law and the Gospel, sin and justice, flesh and Spirit,

[1] *Summaire*, ch. 15.
[2] doctrinae index disciplina est; Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum*, 43, 2.
[3] Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 113.
[4] A. W. Pollard, *The Beginning of the NT, translated by William Tyndale* (Oxford, 1926), facs.

incredulity and faith, merit and grace, human traditions and Scriptures. Patrick Hamilton adds besides: condition and promises, man's free will and God's free election. All these can be found in their masters, in Luther, Melanchthon and Zwingli; those antitheses had already made their way, so to say, and came to dominate as commonplaces in Reformation thinking and Bible-interpretation.

Although Patrick Hamilton did not know Farel's *Summary*, there is in some points a striking similarity of ideas and even of words between his *Places* and the *Summary*. Patrick says: 'The Law showeth us our sin, our condemnation, is the word of ire' ['verbum irae']; Farel said: 'The Law of God, true rule to live well, shows to men their faults . . . and produces horror, servile fear, ire and indignation.' There are still other analogies to be found, and no wonder, because both men lived in the same world of fresh evangelical belief, spiritual conflicts, the struggle for liberty and emancipation of the understanding of the Bible. My second thesis is that the Bible created this liberty, of which the most important quality was that it brought man continually back to the Bible itself.

'The Scripture is the cause why men believe the Scripture.' These words are taken from the *Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*, by William Tyndale, 1531. In the early writings of Tyndale, before More issued his *Dialogue*, 1527, the doctrine of Scripture is not yet consciously in the centre. There is no real doctrine of Scripture developed in them at all; only passing remarks are found, but the firm conviction, that only in Scripture can God's revelation for man be found, is without any doubt the presupposition of everything Tyndale says. Therefore the analysis of More's and Tyndale's arguments, compared with the later more fully developed Protestant doctrine of the sufficiency, the necessity, the *autopistia* and the perspicuity of the Scripture, shows an important general bearing on our theme.[1]

In the beginning of the same year, 1525, as Farel's *Summaire* and Zwingli's *De vera et falsa religione commentarius* appeared at Basel and Zürich, a book of no less controversial character was

[1] Ellen Flesseman – van Leet, 'The Controversy about Scripture and Tradition between Th. More and W. Tyndale', *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, XLIII, 1959, pp. 143-64.

published at Strasbourg: *Farrago omnium fere rerum theologicarum*, otherwise *Libri 385 Paradoxorum*. The author was Francis Lambert, a former Grey Friar of Avignon, who was converted to the Reformation during a journey he had to make in Switzerland on behalf of his monastery. He had a dispute with Zwingli,[1] was converted, and continued his travels to Wittenberg. The influence of Luther's theology is very clear in his numerous works, but there was a manifest inclination to radicalism in his character. At the famous religious disputation at Marburg, 1529, he had adopted the Zwinglian doctrine of the Lord's supper, while at an earlier date he was a supporter of Luther's doctrine.[2] As there was no place for him at Wittenberg, he wandered a good deal of his life. In 1524 Francis Lambert came to Strasbourg, one year before Farel. The first chapter of the *Farrago*, which he drafted there, is entitled: 'How came such a serious blindness of the world, which reigned so many centuries, during which the truth of God's Scriptures was hidden'; and it begins: 'By Christ and the apostles has been announced exactly the same truth, which now by His grace and Spirit is revealed anew. Night and darkness have passed by and the lovable day of truth is now near.'[3] Again the same words we have met already and which are the expression of the profound experience men had in those days. According to Francis Lambert the Spirit of God is the sole legitimate interpreter of the Scriptures and of the mysteries of the Most High (ch. 4; cf. 1 Cor. 2.7, 8), but during the centuries of darkness many of the plainest texts of the Scriptures have been forgotten and hidden by the doctrines of the scholae (ch. 8). In all this, Francis Lambert is a no less true Melanchthonian than a Lutheran.

In 1527 he became the first professor of theology at Marburg, the capital of Philip of Hesse, where the first Protestant university was established in 1526. It was here that Patrick Hamilton, encouraged by Francis Lambert, wrote his *Loci Communes* for the first academic disputation ever held at Marburg, as we are told. The respectful opinion which Francis Lambert had of a noble

[1] O. Farner, *Huldrych Zwingli* (Zürich, 1954), vol. III, p. 265f.
[2] F. W. Hassencamp, *Fr. Lambert von Avignon* (Elberfeld, 1860), pp. 59-63.
[3] F. Lamberti Avenionensis *Exegeseos in s. Divi Ioannis Apocalypsim*, libri VII [Marpurgi, 1528]; D. Laing, *The Works of John Knox* (Edinburgh, 1846), vol. I, pp. 502, 503.

Scotsman and which he published after the martyrdom in the preface of one of his numerous commentaries is well known[1]; he testified that Patrick was so learned that he had nothing further to teach him. It is of course, hard to say whether Patrick was not influenced, and to what extent, by the fierce and radical convictions of the Marburg reformer. Again, two years later, Francis Lambert, after having published some other books, issued another summary, entitled *Somme Chrestienne*, dedicated in its preface to the Emperor Charles V. As the late friar had many years before presumed to have received a vocation to be the reformer of France,[2] as Luther was of Germany, but not having succeeded at all in this part, he now turned to the Emperor. This *Somme Chrestienne* as such was unknown to his biographer Hassencamp, in 1860, and to all who came after him, and has only recently been reprinted by Dr G. Müller, the author of the article on Francis Lambert in the new edition of the theological encyclopaedia *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*.[3] Hassencamp believed that it had been translated into English. This was a mistake. In Pollard and Redgrave's *Short-title Catalogue* is mentioned under the name of Francis Lambert *The summe of christianitie*, 1536, translated by T[ristram] Revel.[4] This book, however, is not the translation of Lambert's *Somme Chrestienne*, but of his *Farrago*. So we find here another case of the use of the word 'summe' in those Reformation days as a substitution for a 'farrago paradoxorum', with the explanation at the end of the prologue, that 'paradoxe' means 'conclusyon or posicyon or questyon'.

This *Somme Chrestienne* contains six articles or chapters, not very well arranged from a systematic point of view, another kind of 'loci communes', we can say, of a lower order. Some articles are directly addressed to the monarch, and speak about his imperial duties (7, 28). The emperor took it very much amiss that Philip of Hesse had sent him this book by his ambassador, and no wonder. In the dedicatory epistle the author says in a naïve, or rather bold, manner that the Landgrave had commanded him to write this sum; for it is well known, this was the argument, that Your Majesty disapproves all things

[1] See p. 344, note 3.
[2] Hassencamp, op. cit., p. 25.
[3] G. Müller, 'Franz Lambert von Avignon und die Reformation in Hessen', *Veröff. des Histor. Komm. für Hessen und Waldeck* (Marburg, 1958), 24.4, pp. 134-77.
[4] No. 15179.

which do not agree with the holy will of God, revealed to mankind in the holy Scriptures. As these words appeared to have scandalised the Emperor extraordinarily, poor Philip could not excuse himself otherwise than by saying that the book was not so bad as his opinion of it. Most chapters of it, however, show sharp polemical tendencies, e.g. rejection of prophecy (7), synagogue of Satan (11), reign of Satan (13), voice of the Antichrist (17), idolatry (25), etc., each followed by its antithesis: holy and true prophecy (5), Church of God (10), reign of God (12), voice of Jesus Christ (16), sanctification (23), etc. Francis Lambert emphasises the need of plain and sure instruction of the people in the Church of Christ, and this only by the doctrine of the Bible, with the express exclusion of the deceiving spirit and of human tradition (1-4). The 'thesis' that every simple Christian believer is able to understand the Scriptures could well have been upheld by Francis Lambert. In the theory concerning good works he agrees fundamentally with *Patrick's Places*, for faith only justifies man before God, and good works can only testify that he whose work they are is faithful and just, that is: justified by our Lord's grace; there is nothing of merit in them, for all merit belongs to Jesus Christ only and he who says that our works give satisfaction for our sins, wrongs our Lord and the merits of His death (33, 43, 52). Although there is no literal relation between the three authors whose more or less popular books we have reviewed thus far, it is clear that they all agree in fundamental biblical principles. The thesis might be drawn up, that the Bible—in the vernacular language—functioned for them as a handbook of dogmatics, and as a text-book for the congregation and its Christian life.

None of them, it should be admitted, reached the high level of Melanchthon's *Loci*. Yet it would be a serious mistake to suggest that Melanchthon's *Loci* is above all a scientific work, for academic use, and out of the way of popular instruction. In the article in the *Loci* on justification and faith it is said: 'scholastica fides nihil nisi mortua opinio'; that is to say, Melanchthon is out to cultivate living faith and therefore he needs an audience. He finds this not only at the university, but also in the congregation. In the dedicatory epistle to his first *Loci* he asserts, primarily, a threefold intention. First of all he wants the youth to understand by these 'main Loci of Christian

doctrine' what they have first of all to seek in the Scriptures ('quae sint in scripturis potissimum requirenda'); and secondly he avoids not only drawing anybody away from the Scriptures by bringing his *Loci* into the forefront, but he rather urges everybody, as much as one can, to come to the Scriptures, for there is nothing he desires more intensely than that 'all Christians should feel at home in and be transformed into the character of the divine Scriptures' ('immo nihil perinde optarim atqui si fieri possit, christianos omnes in solis divinis literis liberrime versari et in illarum indolem plane transformari'). Here the humanist, the lover of bonae litterae, the doctor who goes 'ad fontes', is speaking and, as we have already seen, the intention behind the *Loci* is to make a better understanding of the Bible possible. Thirdly, Melanchthon declares with great emphasis that everybody errs who seeks the rule for Christian faith elsewhere than in the canonical Scriptures ('fallitur, quisquis aliunde christianismi formam petit quam e scriptura canonica'). It is as we have said before: the 'summae' and 'loci' of the early Reformation lead back to the Bible because in the last resort they have been inspired by the Bible. Christian liberty has been created by the Bible; so it could only stand firm if it remained within the spiritual reach of the Bible.

The times were gone when the Scriptures and Scripture-reading were the privileges of an often fully incompetent clergy and under the guardianship of a not seriously interested Church. For popular instruction, as practised by numerous minor adherents of the Reformation, the scientific labours of the great humanists and theologians have been of inestimable significance. We will still have to come back to the problems implied in these facts, but we might say now already that no double truth, one for scholars and another for the congregation, has ever been adopted by the reformers. Academic learning is not within everybody's power; that is what they were fully conscious of. But there was a virtue that linked academic learning and simple belief: that is the Spirit or, as St. John says, the unction that teaches all things that human intelligence cannot achieve by itself. This is Melanchthon's interpretation of 1 John 2.20, 27. From the beginning scholarly theology and simple faith were joined together, although many sad disappointments awaited the reformers in this field. It is, on the other hand,

hardly possible for us to feel with the reformers the deep joy they experienced, in preaching and teaching the fresh truth they had discovered, which was to be 'to all people'. One more quotation from Melanchthon may reproduce an adequate expression of his own experience. It is in a letter, written in 1520 to a friend, and accompanying his academic lecture on St. Paul's doctrine, 'Declamatiuncula in divi Pauli doctrinam', Melanchthon tries to make his friend feel the great difference, the deep contrast between traditional scholastic learning and the purity and freshness of the only source of true religious life which is the Bible. 'What do you feel', he asks, 'now you have been saved from the shipwreck of human traditions and fictitious learning; do you not seem to yourself to be in another world now? Does not the Spirit of Christ make you feel quite differently?'[1] Zwingli was very much in line with Melanchthon, as he wrote in his treatise 'On the clearness and the certitude of God's Word', 1522: 'If you have the experience that the Word of God is renewing you and that you begin to love God more than before, when you were still listening to human doctrines, you should be sure that it is God who has worked this within you.'[2]

We must not object to the coarse criticisms with which the humanists and the reformers alike censured the inveterate abuses which were practised in the Church. They were only too well justified and they were stimulated by the far more serious religious and moral life which matured as a result of the new contact with the Bible. Its newly discovered authority granted a merry feeling of independence to those for whom religious truth had now really become vital.

From here it may be clear that there has existed a good number of varying opinions in the field of religious propaganda in the Reformation-period in different countries. In the nineteenth century special attention was drawn by Dutch scholars to what came to be called a 'tertium genus reformationis' which, apart from Lutheranism and Calvinism, arose as an autochthonous kind of Reformation in the Netherlands; this terminology having been dropped—for there are still more subordinate trends in the Reformation—we prefer now to speak of

[1] R. Stupperich, *Melanchthons Werke* (Gütersloh, 1951), I, p. 47.
[2] C.R. Zwingli, I, p. 384.

'biblical humanism'. The biblical humanists followed the trend of Erasmus, that is to say, many traditional, orthodox elements remained in their convictions, as for example in their christology and soteriology and in the doctrine of justification by faith alone but, as a question of accent, there was less preoccupation with sound theological reflection in this rather unphilosophical current than with moral application. They had a still greater social interest than Farel had. Not by their number but by the spiritual character of its adherents this movement exercised a strong reforming influence.[1] A fine specimen of this biblical humanism is another *Summary of the divine Scriptures*, published in the Netherlands, perhaps at Leiden, 1523. It is known in Dutch history as the first book written in Dutch which was censured by imperial decree of 1524, the first 'Index librorum prohibitorum' in the Netherlands. In this 'Index' the book is entitled: a 'summary, or dutch [duytsche] theology'. We notice once again that the expressions: 'sum of the Scriptures' and 'theology' have been used as though identical. The book is the Dutch translation, by the author himself, of a manuscript, originally written in Latin, to be read in a convent and which was only published in 1527, that is three years later than the Dutch translation. The Latin text is entitled: *Oeconomica christiana*.

This book has had a great and widespread history. It has been translated into French, German, Italian, and into English under the title *The summe of the holy scripture and ordinarye of Christian teachyng*. It seems to have been printed for the first time at Antwerp. In the *Short-title Catalogue*, Pollard and Redgrave mention no fewer than six reprints.[2] 'Ordinary' in this title is the translation of 'oeconomica'; the Latin word 'ordinarium', apart from the book which contains the 'ordo' of the divine office, may be, according to Murray, a doctrinal manual containing instruction for the conduct of life: 'the ordynarye of Chrysten men' (1502); 'the Ordenarye for all faithfull Christians to leade a Vertuous and Godlyc lyfe' (1578). Our book has a practical aspect indeed. The rare word 'oeconomica' may have no other sense.

[1] J. Reitsma, *Geschiedenis van de Hervorming en de Hervormde Kerk in de Nederlanden*, 5th ed. by J. Lindeboom (The Hague, 1949), p. 27.

[2] No. 3036-3041, anonymous, transl. by S. Fish.

Since 1530, this *Summe* has more than once been censured in England, in France and in Italy. The author uses the antithetical way of religious argumentation we have already become acquainted with, but he avoids syllogisms and short articles; his chapters are more ample and coherent and therefore easy to read. Henry van Bommel, in his early years rector of the Magdalen Convent of the Sisters of Common Life, at Utrecht, is generally considered the author of this 'summe'. He wrote a number of other works of which a 'Confutatio determinationis doctorum Parrhisiensium, contra M.L., Basilaea 1523' may be mentioned. He left his country and was a minister and a school-inspector in the Rhineland afterwards for some thirty years.

In the prologue of his 'summe', Henry says: 'The law makes us despair'—it is the same expression as Patrick Hamilton was to use in 1527—'that we ever can fulfil Gods commandment. The Gospel on the contrary makes us hope anew with certitude and trust.' To reach these two things, that is the reason why all the Scriptures have been written, he says. Here we acknowledge the method used by almost all theologians who have drawn up a 'summa' or what is like it in different periods of church history: they have one main doctrinal conception; guided by it, they try to elucidate all the Scriptures. Most likely the great work of the fourth century father Hilary of Poitiers, now known under the title *De trinitate*, was originally very simply entitled *De fide*: the problem of his days being Arianism, any orthodox book 'de fide' was necessarily a biblical treatise of the true divinity of Jesus Christ.[1] So in Henry van Bommel's days 'de fide' had simply to be a treatise on the problem of law and grace. In such a way Luther taught and wrote, so did Melanchthon and so the old medieval question 'de veritatibus catholicis' got its new, sixteenth-century aspect. At any rate this kind of Reformation-theology arose from the Bible and recurred to it, without exception.

Great importance is attached by the author to a clear conception of faith, as he himself says, but his definition is rather poor, from a theological point of view. His soteriology is orthodox, the redemption by Christ's sacrifice being the heart of it. But he has nothing more to say than that faith is necessary,

[1] O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 2nd ed. (Freiburg, 1923), III, p. 377.

giving certitude of salvation, and that unbelief is what Christ blamed most of all things in His disciples. We notice once again the antithesis of faith and unbelief. So much, then, for the first fifteen chapters of his *Summe*. The rest, that is to say two thirds of the book, has a practical tendency. Much could be said about the rather complicated relations between the Dutch and the original Latin text and about the structure of the *Summe* in general; still more about its relations with contemporary reformation currents in the Netherlands and about the influence of Luther's and of Oecolampadius' ideas upon it. But other observations will be still more apt to our theme.

From here arises the special problem as to what the role of the understanding of the Scriptures will be in the history of the Reformation from a theological point of view. To sum up what I have tried to illustrate, I refer to the clear words of Zwingli. In the Introduction of his *Commentary on true and false belief*, dedicated in 1525 to the king of France, he says: 'It is . . . very easy for us to write about the true and false religion of Christians and to give, as it were, an account of our faith which we have derived not from the stagnant pools of human wisdom, but from the rain of the Divine Spirit, which is the Word of God.'[1] The Word of God is the Bible, but the Bible is the Book of the divine Spirit. It is Zwingli's conviction, as we saw earlier, that 'a man learns the Word and meaning of God not from man, but from the one Spirit of God'. Also Luther, from whom he differed so widely in the doctrine of the Lord's supper, according to his own words, paid homage to the principle, 'Fides ergo magistra et interpres est verborum.'[2] Faith, according to Zwingli, cannot be formed from the words of the Bible; the latter are to be understood under the guidance of faith and must yield to faith.[3] There seems to be something paradoxical in this formula, but I think that in it the background finds expression from which the Protestant doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible should by preference be interpreted: the killing effect of the letter in it can be restrained, and on the other hand the overwhelming part played by the Bible in the Reformation can be explained in a better and more satisfying way. Here

[1] C.R. Zwingli, III, p. 639; cf. Davies, op. cit., p. 69.
[2] *Amica exegesis*, C.R. Zwingli, V, p. 663; cf. Davies, op. cit., p. 81.
[3] *Auslegen und Gründe der Schlussreden*, C.R. Zwingli, II, p. 75; Davies, op. cit., p. 72.

too is to be found in the last resort, the ground of that Protestant certitude in Bible-understanding and in the interpretation of Christianity in general which played such a part in the making of the Reformation. The fact that faith in Scripture is, e.g. for Tyndale, always faith in the saving message of Scripture, on the other hand, safeguarded the early reformers from any trace of bibliolatry and fundamentalism.[1] 'I know for certain'—these are Zwingli's words—'that God teaches me, for I have experienced . . . you must leave all [other] things on one side and learn God's meaning simply from His own simple Word.'[2]

[1] Flesseman, op. cit., p. 156.
[2] *Klarheit*, C.R. Zwingli, I, p. 379; cf. Davies, op. cit., p. 65.

NECESSARY BEING

by The Rev. Professor JOHN H. HICK

I

'Necessary being' is one of the terms by means of which Christian thought has sought to define the difference between God and man. The notion of necessary being, applied to God and withheld from man, indicates that God and man differ not merely in the characteristics which they possess but more fundamentally, in their modes of being, or in the fact that they exist in different senses of the word 'exist'.

That such a distinction, however it may be best expressed, is essential to the Christian concept of God is agreed virtually on all hands. Paul Tillich in our own day emphasises the distinction to the extent of using different terms to refer to the reality of God and of man respectively. Human beings and other created things exist; God, on the other hand, does not exist, but is Being-itself. This is the most recent way of formulating a discrimination which has been classically expressed in the history of Christian thought by the idea of the necessary being of God in contrast to the contingent being of man and of the whole created order.

There are, however, two importantly different concepts which may be, and which have been, expressed by the phrase 'necessary being'. 'Necessity', in a philosophical context, usually means logical necessity, and gives rise in theology to the concept of a being such that it is logically impossible that this being should not exist. But this is not the only kind of necessity referred to in philosophical literature. The non-logical concepts of causal, empirical and material necessity can be grouped together as forms of *factual* necessity. The distinction between logical and factual necessity first appears, so far as I know, in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, where Kant treats of the three modal categories of possibility, existence and necessity. The category of necessity is derived by him from the necessary or analytic proposition in formal logic. But its schema in time is the existence of an object throughout all time[1]; and the correspond-

[1] B.184.

ing 'postulate of empirical thought' is called by Kant *die materiale Notwendigkeit* and is equivalent to what is often described as causal necessity, i.e. being part of the universal causal system of nature.[1] The schema of necessity as existence throughout all time suggests the notion of a temporally unlimited being, and this is an important part, though not the whole, of the concept of God as a factually necessary being. I shall argue that the notion of factual necessity, when appropriately spelled out, is an essential element in the Christian doctrine of God, but that the notion of logical necessity is both philosophically and religiously profitless, and indeed even dangerous, to theology.

It is important to distinguish explicitly between logical and factual necessity, not only for the elucidation of the doctrine of God within the Church, but also in the interests of apologetics. For a number of contemporary philosophers of the analytical school have assumed that Christian theology requires the notion of logically necessary being, and having noted that this idea is rendered meaningless by the modern understanding of the nature of logical necessity, have rejected what they suppose to be the Christian concept of God. They are, however, I believe, mistaken in their initial assumption. My thesis thus has a threefold bearing. I wish to suggest, as a matter of theology, that the idea of the divine being as factually necessary is more adequate to the data of Christian faith than the idea of God's being as logically necessary; and as a matter of philosophy, that the idea of factually necessary being is immune from the criticisms which have rightly been levelled against the notion of logically necessary being; and as a matter of history, that the notion of God's being as factually necessary has a stronger claim to be regarded as the normative Christian use of the term 'necessary being' than has its interpretation in terms of logical necessity.

Let us begin with the idea of logically necessary being. To say that God has logically necessary being, or that His existence is logically necessary, is to say that it is logically impossible that God should not exist; or that the concept of God is such that the proposition 'God exists' is a logical, analytic or *a priori* truth; or again that the proposition 'God does not exist' is a self-contradiction, a statement of such a kind that it is logically im-

[1] B.279-80.

possible for it to be true. Such a claim, however, contravenes one of the fundamental positions of empiricist philosophy—that an existential proposition (i.e. a proposition asserting existence) cannot be logically necessary. For modern empiricism is largely founded upon the distinction between, in Hume's phrases, 'the relations between ideas' on the one hand, and 'matters of fact and existence' on the other. Given this distinction, logical necessity clearly belongs exclusively to the sphere of the relations between ideas. The ideas of 'larger' and 'smaller' for example, are such that it is a logically necessary truth that if A is larger than B, then B is smaller than A, the necessity arising from the meanings which we have given to the words 'larger' and 'smaller'. On the same principle, such propositions as 'God is omniscient' and 'God is omnipotent' express necessary truths, if 'God' has been defined as 'a being who is omniscient and omnipotent' or, compendiously, as 'unlimited Being'. Given this definition, it is not only a truth but an analytic truth that God is omniscient and omnipotent; for the definition renders it incorrect to call a Being 'God' who is other than omniscient and omnipotent. But, on the other hand, 'God exists' cannot be treated in the same way. God cannot be *defined* as existing. For, in the familiar slogan which has emerged from the critiques of the Ontological Argument, existence is not a predicate. To say that *x* exists is not to define, or to expand the definition of, the term '*x*', but is to assert that this term refers to some object. And whether a given description has a referent or, to use another terminology, whether a given term has denotation, is a question of fact which cannot be settled *a priori*.

The logical doctrine involved, which had been previously clearly delineated by Hume and Kant, has been formulated definitively in our own time by Bertrand Russell in his theory of descriptions.[1] Russell showed that the question 'Does *x* exist?' does not imply that in some prior sense the *x* of which we speak is, or subsists, or has being; and further, that the assertion that *x* exists is not an attribution to a subsisting *x* of the further characteristic of existence. It is rather the assertion, with regard to a certain description (or name as standing for a description) that this description has a referent. Thus 'horses

[1] *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy*, 2nd edn. (1920), ch. 16.

exist' has the logical structure: 'there are *x*'s such that "*x* is a horse" is true'. Such an analysis exorcises the puzzle which has tended since the time of Plato to haunt negative existential propositions. 'Unicorns do not exist' does not entail that unicorns must first in some mysterious sense *be* in order that we may then say of them that they do not exist; it means simply that 'there are no *x*'s such that "*x* is a unicorn" is true'. And 'God exists' means 'there is one (and only one) *x* such that "*x* is omniscient, omnipotent, etc." is true'. This Russelian analysis makes plain the logical structure of propositions asserting existence. Their structure is such that they cannot be true by definition, nor therefore by *a priori* necessity. Hence the concept of a being such that the proposition asserting its existence is a logically necessary truth, is a self-contradictory concept. There cannot—logically cannot—be a being whose non-existence is logically impossible. I conclude then that we must on philosophical grounds repudiate all talk of God as having necessary being, when the necessity in question is construed as logical necessity.

Granting then that the notion of God's existence as *logically* necessary has to be ruled out as untenable, it is perhaps worth asking, as a matter of history, whether this notion has in fact figured at all prominently in Christian thought.[1] The first great thinker of the Church who comes to mind in this connexion is Anselm. The ontological argument, to the effect that the concept of God, as the concept of the greatest conceivable being, entails the existence of God, appears to be an attempt to show that the proposition 'God exists' is a logically necessary truth. Certainly Descartes' version of the ontological argument has this character. According to Descartes, as the concept of a triangle entails the truth that its internal angles are jointly equal to two right angles, so the concept of God entails the truth that God exists.[2] But in Anselm himself there is another line of thought which stands in conflict with such an interpretation. In the second formulation of the ontological argu-

[1] Whether or not this notion occurs prominently in Christian thought it does apparently have a place in Muslim theology. Apparently the *pons asinorum* which the theological novice must cross is the distinction between the necessary, the possible and the impossible; and the necessary is defined as that the non-existence of which cannot be thought. (D. B. Macdonald, *Aspects of Islam* (London, 1911), p. 121.)

[2] *Meditations*, V.

ment, in the third chapter of the *Proslogion*, we read that 'it is possible to conceive of a being which cannot be conceived not to exist (*potest cogitari esse aliquid, quod non possit cogitari non esse*)'. On the face of it this statement would seem to confirm the view that Anselm has in mind what we would today call the notion of logically necessary being. For the most natural interpretation of his words, at any rate by a twentieth-century reader, is that a being which cannot be conceived not to exist means a being whose non-existence is logically inconceivable, that is to say, logically impossible. However, when we turn to Anselm's reply to Gaunilo we find that he states explicitly what he means by the notion of beings which can and which cannot be conceived not to exist. 'All those objects, and those alone,' he says, 'can be conceived not to exist, which have a beginning or end or composition of parts: also . . . whatever at any place or at any time does not exist as a whole. That being alone, on the other hand, cannot be conceived not to exist, in which any conception discovers neither beginning nor end nor composition of parts (*nec initium nec finem nec partium conjunctionem*), and which any conception finds always and everywhere as a whole.'[1]

Here we have something quite different from the claim that 'God exists' is a logically necessary truth. We have instead the essence of the contrasting notion of factual necessity—the notion, that is, of God as sheer, ultimate, unconditioned reality, without origin or end. Another aspect of the concept of factual necessity, namely *aseity*, is contributed by Anselm in the *Monologion*, where he draws the distinction between existence *a se* and existence *ab alio*. He says of God: 'The supreme Substance, then, does not exist through any efficient agent, and does not derive existence from any matter, and was not aided in being brought into existence by any external causes. Nevertheless, it by no means exists through nothing, or derives existence from nothing; since, through itself and from itself, it is whatever it is (*per seipsam et ex seipsa est quidquid est*).'[2] The relation between this aspect of Anselm's thought and his ontological argument is another and difficult question into which I do not propose to enter; I only wish, for the present purpose, to point to the presence, often I think unnoticed, of the notion of factually necessary being in his discussions.

[1] *Responsio editoris*, ch. IV. Cf. *Proslogion*, ch. XXII. [2] Ch. VI.

Let us now turn the centuries to Thomas Aquinas, who explicitly uses the term 'necessary being'.[1] The conclusion of his Third Way argument is that 'there must exist something the existence of which is necessary (*oportet aliquid esse necessarium in rebus*).[2] But he also, I believe, like Anselm, uses the idea of necessary existence in the sense of factually, and not logically, necessary existence. For in the Third Way passage the mark of contingency is transciency, or temporal finitude—having a beginning and an end in time. And by contrast the mark of non-contingency, or of the necessary being of God, must be not having a beginning or an end in time—in other words, *eternal* being.

Can we then perhaps equate contingent with transient existence, and necessary with eternal existence? The answer that must be given, which is also the answer implicit in Thomas, is No. Eternity is one of the ingredients of the necessary being of the Godhead, but is not by itself sufficient. For it is possible to conceive of something existing eternally, not because it is such that there is and could be no power capable of abolishing it, but only because, although there are powers capable of abolishing it, they always refrain from doing so. Such a being would be eternal by courtesy of the fact that it is never destroyed but not by the positive virtue or power of being indestructible. And it is surely integral to the Christian concept of God that God, as the ultimate Lord of all, is not capable of being destroyed.

We must add at this point that, as the ultimate Lord of all, God is also incorruptible, in the sense of being incapable of ceasing either to exist or to possess His divine characteristics by reason of an inner decay or discerption. God can neither be destroyed from without nor suffer dissolution from within.

Indestructibility and incorruptibility, however, even taken together, cannot replace but must supplement the notion of eternal being. For it is possible to conceive of something being both indestructible and incorruptible and yet not eternal in the sense of being without beginning or end. Such a being would exist only if created, but once created would be indissoluble and indestructible.

[1] *Summa Theologica*, bk. I, q. 2, art. 3.

[2] cf. Norman Malcolm, 'Anselm's Ontological arguments', *Philosophical Review*, January 1960.

In Thomist theology angels and human souls are held to have precisely this character, on the ground that they are simple substances. They have a beginning by divine creation, but once created they exist for ever, unless of course destroyed by omnipotent divine action. As incorruptible, such beings are described as necessary beings, and it is presumably these, and perhaps especially angels, that Thomas has in mind when he distinguishes in the Third Way passage between necessary beings which have their necessary existence caused by another and ultimately necessary being which does not have its necessary existence caused by another, but which is uncreated and is God. Some Thomist theologians describe these two kinds of necessary being as, in the one case, intrinsically but not extrinsically necessary, and in the other case, both intrinsically and extrinsically necessary. These definitional refinements do not concern us here except as emphasising that in Thomist thought the notion of necessary being is not an all-or-nothing logical concept but is a factual notion, capable of degrees and qualifications; so that the distinction between necessary and contingent being is not to be correlated with the distinction between logically necessary and contingent truths. Necessity is for Thomas a factual or ontic and not a logical characteristic.

I conclude then, concerning Thomas, that whilst he does not explicitly make the distinction between logical and factual necessity, in practice he cleaved so consistently to one side of the distinction that he was not led into any important ambiguity or confusion by the lack of an explicit separation of the two notions. However, some Thomist writers of our own day do fall into the ambiguity which their master avoided. M. Maritain, for example,[1] uses an instance of logical necessity to illustrate the idea of existence *a se*, thereby revealing that he is not conscious of the difference between these two notions. He first defines necessary existence in these terms: 'a thing is necessary when it *cannot* be prevented, contingent when it *can* be prevented. A thing is *absolutely necessary* when nothing can prevent it from being.' This is a clear enough account of the notion of existence *a se*. But in the next sentence Maritain offers an example from mathematics. 'Thus the properties of the

[1] 'Necessity and Contingency' in *Essays in Thomism*, edited by Robert E. Brennan (New York, 1942).

sphere,' he says, 'are absolutely necessary' (27). Now the properties of a sphere—for example, the fact that every point on its surface is equidistant from the centre—are indeed absolutely necessary; that is to say, there could not possibly be a sphere which lacked these properties. But the reason for this is not that there is nothing that can *prevent* a sphere from having these properties, but simply that these properties belong to the definition of 'sphere'. There is nothing to prevent there being objects which approximate in varying degrees to this particular set of properties, but such objects would not be called spheres for the simple reason that we have chosen to confine the name 'sphere' to objects which fit certain specifications, which thus constitute the defining and necessary properties of a sphere.

II

If a skilled theologian can suppose that the Christian concept of God requires the notion of logically necessary existence, we can hardly blame secular philosophers if they make the same assumption and proceed to draw damaging conclusion from it. I should like in this connexion to refer to the much discussed article by Professor J. N. Findlay of London University, entitled 'Can God's existence be disproved?'[1] in which he derives from the self-contradictory nature of the idea of logically necessary being what he regards as a strict disproof of divine existence. To see what is amiss with Findlay's argument is by contrast to see a little more clearly the outlines of a religiously and philosophically acceptable account of the unique mode of being of the Godhead.

Professor Findlay is, so far as I know, the first philosopher to have proposed an *a priori* proof of the non-existence of God. He puts the ontological argument into reverse by contending that the concept of deity, so far from guaranteeing the existence of an object corresponding to it, is such as to guarantee that no object corresponds to it.

Findlay defines the concept of God as that of the adequate object of religious attitudes, a religious attitude being described as one in which we tend 'to abase ourselves before some object, to defer to it wholly, to devote ourselves to it with unquestioning

[1] *Mind*, 1948. Reprinted in *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*, edited by Flew and Macintyre (London, 1955).

enthusiasm, to bend the knee before it, whether literally or metaphorically',[1] such an attitude is rationally adopted only by one who believes that the object to which he relates himself as worshipper has certain very remarkable characteristics. Findlay lists the most important of these characteristics. First, an adequate object of religious attitudes must be conceived as being infinitely superior to ourselves in value or worth. (Accordingly Findlay refers to this object as 'he' rather than as 'it'.) Second, he must be conceived as being unique: God must not merely be one of a class of beings of the same kind, but stand in an asymmetrical relationship to all other objects as the source of whatever value they may have. Third, says Findlay, the adequate objects of religious attitudes must be conceived as not merely happening to exist, but as existing necessarily; if he merely happened to exist he would not be worthy of the full and unqualified attitude of worship. And fourth, this being must be conceived as not merely happening to possess his various characteristics, but as possessing them in some necessary manner. For our present purpose we may conflate these two necessities, necessary existence and the necessary possession of properties, and treat them as one. It should be borne in mind throughout that in Findlay's argument 'necessary' means 'logically necessary'.

It is the last two in his list of requirements that provide the ground for Findlay's ontological disproof of theism. 'For if God is to satisfy religious claims and needs, he must be a being in every way inescapable, One whose existence and whose possession of certain excellencies we cannot possibly conceive away. And modern views make it self-evidently absurd (if they don't make it ungrammatical) to speak of such a Being and attribute existence to him.'[2] For, as we have already noted, post-Humean empiricism can assign no meaning to the idea of necessary existence, since nothing can be conceived to exist that cannot also be conceived not to exist. No propositions of the form '*x* exists' can be analytically true. Hence, Findlay argues, the concept of an adequate object of religious attitudes, involving as it does the notion of a necessarily existent being who possesses his characteristic in some necessary manner, is a self-contradictory concept. We can know *a priori*, from inspec-

[1] *New Essays*, p. 49. [2] op. cit., p. 55.

tion of the idea itself, that there is and can be no such being.

We may distinguish in Findlay's argument a philosophical premise to the effect that no existential propositions can be necessary truths, and a theological premise to the effect that an adequate object of religious worship must be such that it is logically necessary that he exists. Of these two premises I wish to accept the former and reject the latter. I deny, that is to say, the theological doctrine that God must be conceived, if at all, in such a way that 'God exists' is a logically necessary truth. I deny this for precisely the same reason as Findlay, namely that the demand that 'God exists' should be a necessary truth is, like the demand that a circle should be square, not a proper demand at all, but a misuse of language. Only, whereas Findlay concludes that the notion of an adequate object of religious attitude is an absurdity, I conclude that that of which the idea is an absurdity cannot be an adequate object of religious attitudes; it would on the contrary be an unqualifiedly *in*adequate object of worship.

Let us then ask the question, which seems highly appropriate at this point, as to how religious persons actually think of the Being whom they regard as the adequate object of their worship. What aspect of the Christian experience of God lies behind the idea of necessary being?

The concept of God held by the biblical writers was based upon their experience of God as awesome power and holy will confronting them and drawing them into the sphere of His ongoing purpose. God was known as a dynamic will interacting with their own wills; a sheer given reality, as inescapably to be reckoned with as destructive storm and life-giving sunshine, or the fixed contours of the land, or the hatred of their enemies and the friendship of their neighbours; indeed even more ineluctably so, as the Book of Jonah emphasises. God was not for them an inferred entity; He was an experienced reality. The biblical writers were (sometimes, though doubtless not at all times) as vividly conscious of being in God's presence as they were of living in a material environment. Their pages resound and vibrate with the sense of God's presence, as a building might resound and vibrate from the tread of some great being walking through it. They thought of this holy presence as unique—as the maker and ruler of the Universe, the sole rightful sovereign

of men and angels, as eternal and infinite, and as the ultimate reality and determining power, in relation to whom His creatures have no standing except as the objects of His grace. But nowhere in the biblical thought about God is use made of the idea of logical necessity. The notion is quite foreign to the characteristically Hebraic and concrete utterances found in the Bible, and forms no part of the biblical concept or concepts of God.

But, it might be said, was it not to the biblical writers inconceivable that God should *not* exist, or that he should cease to exist, or should lose His divine powers and virtues? Would it not be inconceivable to them that God might one day go out of existence, or cease to be good and become evil? And does not this attitude involve an implicit belief that God exists necessarily, and possesses His divine characteristics in some necessary manner? The answer, I think, is that it was to the biblical writers psychologically inconceivable—as we say colloquially, unthinkable—that God might not exist, or that His nature might undergo change. They were so vividly conscious of God that they were unable to doubt His reality, and they were so firmly reliant upon His integrity and faithfulness that they could not contemplate His becoming other than they knew Him to be. They would have allowed as a verbal concession only that there might possibly be no God; for they were convinced that they were at many times directly aware of His presence and of His dealings with them. But the question whether the non-existence of God is *logically* inconceivable, or *logically* impossible, is a purely philosophical puzzle which could not be answered by the prophets and apostles out of their own first-hand religious experience. This does not of course represent any special limitation of the biblical figures. The logical concept of necessary being cannot be given in religious experience. It is an object of philosophical thought and not of religious experience. It is a product—as Findlay argues, a malformed product—of reflection. A religious person's reply to the question, Is God's existence logically necessary? will be determined by his view of the nature of logical necessity; and this is not part of his religion but of his system of logic. The biblical writers in point of fact display no view of the nature of logical necessity, and would doubtless have regarded the topic

as of no religious significance. It cannot reasonably be claimed then, that necessary existence was part of their conception of the adequate object of human worship.

What, we must therefore ask, has led Findlay to hold so confidently that logically necessary existence is an essential element in the religious man's concept of God? His process of thought is revealed in these words: 'We can't help feeling that the worthy object of our worship can never be a thing that merely *happens* to exist, nor one on which all other objects merely *happen* to depend.'[1] The reasoning here is that if a being does not exist by logical necessity, He merely happens to exist; and in this case he ought not to be worshipped as God. But in presenting the dilemma, either God exists necessarily, or he merely happens to exist, Findlay makes the very mistake for which he has criticised the theologians. Findlay should be the last person to use this dichotomy, since he has himself rendered it inoperative by pointing out that one half of the dichotomy is meaningless. And to remove half a dichotomy is to remove the dichotomy. If for example it is said that all human beings are either witches or non-witches, and it is then discovered that there is no such thing as a witch, it becomes pointless, and indeed misleading, to describe everyone as a non-witch. Likewise, having concluded that the notion of necessary existence has no meaning, to continue to speak of things merely *happening* to exist, as though this stood in contrast to some other mode of existing, no longer has any validity. From an empiricist standpoint, there are not two different ways of existing, existing by logical necessity and merely happening to exist. A thing either exists or does not exist; or to be more exact a description either has or does not have a referent. But Findlay, after ruling out the notion of necessary existence, in relation to which alone the contrasting idea of 'merely happening to exist' has any meaning, continues to use the latter category, and what is more, to use it as a term of reproach! This is a very advanced form of the method of having it both ways.

Our conclusion must be that Findlay has only disproved the existence of God if we mean by God a being whose existence is a matter of logical necessity. Since, however, we do not mean this, we may take Findlay's argument instead as emphasising

[1] ibid., p. 52.

that we must either abandon the traditional phrase 'necessary being', or else be very clear that the necessary being of God is not to be construed as *logically* necessary being.

III

We have arrived thus far at an identification of the necessary being of the Godhead with incorruptible and indestructible being without beginning or end. These characteristics, however, can properly be regarded as different aspects of the more fundamental characteristic which the Scholastics termed aseity, or being *a se*. The usual English translation, 'self-existence', is strictly a meaningless phrase, but for the lack of a better we must continue to use it. The core of the notion of aseity is independent being. That God exists *a se* means that He is not dependent upon anything for His existence. In contrast to this the created Universe and everything in it exist *ab alio*. For it is true of each distinguishable item composing the Universe that its existence depends upon some factor or factors beyond itself. Only God exists in total non-dependence; He alone exists absolutely as sheer unconditioned, self-existent being.

From God's aseity, or ontic independence, His eternity, indestructibility and incorruptibility can be seen to follow. A self-existent being must be eternal, i.e. without temporal limitation. For if He had begun to exist, or should cease to exist, He must have been caused to exist, or to cease to exist, by some power other than Himself; and this would be inconsistent with His aseity. By the same token He must be indestructible, for to say that He exists in total ontic independence is to say that there is and could be no reality with the capacity to constitute or to destroy Him; and likewise He must be incorruptible, for otherwise His aseity would be qualified as regards its duration. The question might however be asked at this point: Although it is incompatible with the idea of a self-existent being that He should ever be destroyed from without, yet is there any contradiction in the thought of such a being destroying Himself? Is it not possible in principle that God might 'commit suicide'? The question perhaps deserves more than the brief discussion that is possible within the limits of this paper. I am inclined, however, to think that the query itself is as logically improper as it is obviously religiously improper; and this for three reasons.

First, the expression 'commit suicide' is highly misleading in this context. The 'suicide' of the absolute self-existent being would not be like a human suicide though on a much grander scale. For the concept of divine death is not analogous to that of human death. The death of a human being means the destruction or the cessation of function of his physical body; but God has no physical body to be destroyed, whether by Himself or by another. We have to try to think instead of a purely 'mental suicide'; but so far as I can see this is a completely empty phrase, to which we are able to attach no positive meaning. Second, an absolute end is as inconceivable as is an absolute beginning. Third, there is an additional contradiction in the notion of sheer, unqualified *being* ceasing to exist. Specific modifications of being may alter or cease, but to speak of being itself ceasing to exist is apparently to speak without meaning. I cannot then accept the question as to whether God might commit suicide as a genuine question posing intelligible alternatives.

Finally, to refer back to Findlay's discussion, it is meaningless to say of the self-existent being that He might not have existed or that He merely happens to exist. For what could it mean to say of the eternal, uncreated Creator of everything other than Himself that He 'merely happens to exist'? When we assert of a dependent and temporally finite being, such as myself, that I only happen to exist, we mean that if such-and-such an event had occurred in the past, or if such-and-such another event had failed to occur, I should not now exist. But no such meaning can be given to the statement, 'A self-existent being only happens to exist', or 'might not have existed'. There is no conceivable event such that if it had occurred, or failed to occur, a self-existent being would not have existed; for the concept of aseity is precisely the exclusion of such dependence. There is and could be nothing that would have prevented a self-existent being from coming to exist, for it is meaningless even to speak of a self-existent being as *coming* to exist.

What may properly be meant, then, by the statement that God is, or has, necessary as distinguished from contingent being is that God *is*, without beginning or end, and without origin, cause or ground of any kind whatsoever. He *is*, as the ultimate, unconditioned, absolute, unlimited being.

On the one hand, the fact that God is, is not a logically

necessary truth; for no matter of fact can be logically necessary. The reality of God is a sheer datum. But on the other hand this is an utterly unique datum. That God is, is not one fact amongst others, but is related asymmetrically to all other facts as that which determines them. This is the ultimate given circumstance behind which it is not possible to go with either question or explanation. For to explain something means either to assign a cause to it or to show its place within some wider context in relation to which it is no longer puzzling to us. But the idea of the self-existent Creator of everything other than Himself is the idea of a reality which is beyond the scope of these explanatory procedures. As self-existent, such a being is uncaused, and is therefore not susceptible to the causal type of explanation; and as the Creator of all things other than Himself He stands in no wider context—on the contrary, His creative action constitutes the context in which all else stands. He is the ultimate reality, about which it is no longer meaningful to ask the questions which can be asked concerning other realities. For this reason God cannot but be mysterious to us. He is mysterious, not merely because there are questions about Him to which we do not know the answers, but because we frame questions about Him to which there are no answers since the questions themselves can have meaning only in relation to that which is not ultimate. As the final unconditioned, all-conditioning reality God cannot be included within any system of explanation. This is not to say that we cannot know any truths about Him, but that such truths are not logically deduced conclusions but sheer incorrigible facts disclosed within human experience. We may express this by saying that God has no characterising name; He is not of any kind, or for any reason, or from any cause He just *is*, and is what He is. When He reveals His nature to man He says to Moses 'I shall be what I shall be'[1]; and the fulfilment of that prolepsis is in the fact, the given historical fact, of Jesus Christ.

IV

A further step remains to be taken. For there are two respects in which the concept of aseity is less than adequate to the Christian understanding of God, or at least there are two

[1] Exodus 3.14.

dangers to be guarded against in speaking of God's aseity. One is the danger of understanding aseity in a purely static sense; and the other is the readiness of aseity to be construed in merely negative terms, simply as independence. The next major original treatment of the subject since Aquinas, that of Karl Barth in our own time, would appear to have been undertaken with these two dangers in mind; and it is accordingly to Barth that we now turn.

In his great dogmatic work Barth has a section on the *aseitas Dei* under the heading, *The Being of God in Freedom*.[1] As against any tendency to think of God as static, self-existent substance, the term 'freedom' reminds us that God is the living God, the Life which is the source of all life, and that He is Life not only as an Agent in human time, but also in His own hidden being, apart from and prior to that which is other than Himself. This is an important aspect of the Christian concept of God. The Scholastic '*actus purus*', and the more biblical term 'life', both point to it; and Paul Tillich, in his own theological system, seeks to introduce the same dynamic note when he refers to God as 'the power of Being'. All these terms—pure act, divine life, freedom, and power—are of course symbolic in Tillich's sense of being expressions whose ordinary meaning is partially negated by that to which they point. That is to say (speaking more prosaically) even as we use them we are conscious of certain respects in which they would be misleading if taken literally. However, granting the symbolic character of all these words, the term 'freedom', as Barth uses it, does appear to have special appositeness as supplementing the notion of aseity.

Barth draws a distinction between what he calls the primary, or ontic, and the secondary, or neotic, absoluteness or freedom of God. The former refers to God's absoluteness in Himself, the latter to His absoluteness or Lordship in relation to His creation. This secondary absoluteness is characterised by Barth as total independence; God does not depend for His existence upon any factor external to Himself. From this point of view, He is 'the One who is free from all origination, conditioning or determination from without, by that which is not Himself'.[2] But, Barth insists, we must not think of God's unique mode of being only or even primarily in negative terms, as the absence

[1] *Church Dogmatics*, vol. II, pt. I, ch. VI, § 28, 3. [2] op. cit., p. 307.

of dependence upon His creation. God's absoluteness in relation to the world is secondary and derivative. Behind it there lies the primary absoluteness or freedom which is prior to and outside of all relations. God is free, says Barth, 'quite apart from His relation to another from whom He is free'.[1] God, in His own inner being, entirely apart from His creative action, is intrinsically free, and 'the freedom to exist which He exercises in His revelation is the same which He has in the depths of His eternal being, and which is proper to Him quite apart from His exercise of it ad extra'.[2] This insight of Barth's provides an important balancing note to the traditional discussion of aseity. Instead of being thought of primarily in His relation to the world, even though that relation be one of unqualified independence, God is to be conceived in the first instance as positive self-existence in infinite richness and plenitude. The ultimate Being should not be defined negatively as the One who does not depend upon other beings; on the contrary, His independence of the world is a corollary of His own sheer unique Godness, His infinite and absolute uncreated self-sustaining life.

Barth's doctrine of the primary absoluteness or freedom of God also provides the resources for his response to the question, How can we think of the absolute, self-existent Being as creating a universe and bestowing upon it a relative autonomy over against Himself, and yet remaining unimpaired in His own absolute self-sufficiency and freedom?[3] This however is a distinct, though adjacent, topic which cannot be taken up in the present article.

Finally, a brief summary of conclusions. If we continue (as I think we properly may) to use the expression 'necessary being', we must explicitly interpret it in terms of the concept of factual, as distinguished from logical, necessity.[4] So interpreted, the necessary being of the Godhead is His aseity, understood primarily, however, not as non-dependence upon His creation, but positively, as absolute and unlimited being in infinite plenitude and freedom.

[1] ibid., p. 307. [2] ibid., p. 305.

[3] It should be noted that Barth has developed his position further, in IV/1, ch. XIV, § 59, 1, in the direction of holding that the self-other relationship is already present within the triune Godhead, so that creation does not involve the problem of the inherently unrelated entering into relations.

[4] cf. Terrence Penelhum, 'Divine Necessity', *Mind*, April 1960.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

by Professor OTTO PIPER

The Divine Call

Christian Baptism is rooted in the Baptism of John. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the excavation of Qumran have clearly shown that the Baptism practised by the Primitive Church had little in common with the daily washings of the Jewish sects. Our Baptism is an eschatological event. The foundational significance of the Baptist's ceremony performed in the Jordan river is emphasised by the fact that in all the four Gospels it is described as the beginning of Jesus' messianic ministry. The Gospel of John also informs us that Jesus shared in the Baptist's mission (John 3.22), even though He obviously left the actual ministration to His Disciples (John 4.2). Thus the Baptism which Jesus Himself commanded (Matt. 28.19-20), was the continuation of the eschatological ceremony started by the Baptist, though enriched by the reference to the messianic work of Jesus. The unique character of John's Baptism lies in the Word of God by which he is commanded to call Israel to repentance, to baptise them and to proclaim to them that his work is to usher in the establishment of God's final rule (the 'Kingdom') in this world. By accepting Baptism the Jewish people will be able to escape the final Judgment of God. The connexion in which the Word of God here stands with the eschatological events makes particularly plain what it means when God reveals Himself.

Psychologically such a revelation as John had can be likened to a mental audition. The experience differs from similar ones, however, by the fact that far from increasing the recipient's sense of his importance it rather reduces him to nothingness, because he is aware of his being in the presence of God (cf. Isa. 6.5). Eventually he emerges with the awareness of a divine mission, to which he must completely devote himself.

When God spoke to the Baptist, Israel had for centuries been without a prophet; God had no longer directly spoken to them. As a result they had lost the divine perspective of their national

existence. They took their divine election for granted and interpreted it in purely historical terms. While they still considered themselves as the centre of history, they were interested in their national and international problems rather than in their divine mission for mankind.

The Word of God spoken to the Baptist was destined to stir them up and drag them out of this purely this-worldly view. He who speaks through the prophets is the Creator of this world, and His Word reminds us of the fact that this world is not in existence by itself, but rather as God's work. Thus the Word of God, especially when it touches the very life-line of the nation as in the case of the Baptist (Matt. 11.7-11), is to arouse people from their complacency. Apart from the realisation of a transcendental Creator the universe appears to us a closed and finite system, in which both personal and national existence are ends in themselves. However, when God's Word enters into our lives, the protective walls collapse, which our habits and interests had erected around our existence. His call reminds us that we exist for His cause rather than for ourselves. While we thought that life were meaningful, if only it were in agreement with our environment, we suddenly find ourselves confronted by the totality of the universe created by God. Thereby we do not cease to have a world of our own, which we possess, for which we feel responsible and which conditions us. But when the Creator sends His Word to us, this world of ours is but a small particle of the worlds God has made, and we must relate our world to God's comprehensive purpose. The openness of the universe of which God's Word reminds us does not only mean that it is an infinite world with no conceivable limit of space and time. That image of the world as held by the modern physicist is overawing in its extension but not frightening since by definition it is a homogeneous system throughout. The same elements, the same energies, the same laws of nature that we know in our world will be found in stars which move at distances of millions of light-years away from our earth. The Word of God, however, indicates that this immense universe has no centre and thus no meaning. It derives its meaning exclusively from its Creator.

Thus the Word of God which the Baptist proclaimed to the

Jewish people was first of all to remind them of the fact that notwithstanding their election they were far from being safe. Were they not living in a world, in which nation destroys nation and where no human effort will avail against such a fate? Jesus identified Himself with the Baptist's message yet pointed out that infinitely more was at stake than the national preservation of the Jewish people. By designating Himself as the Son of Man, that is to say the true man, the man in whom the divine plan of Creation has been realised, Jesus reminded His contemporaries of the fact that God's call to baptism made plain the unstable condition of human existence, which in an infinite and uncontrollable universe is surrounded by dangers on all sides. The perils which constantly threaten our health, our life, our income and our social position are relatively small, since a measure of protection against them is available in our own resources and in the services and helps which our fellow-men put at our disposal. God's Word places man at a point of reality, in which he is confronted by his grandeur and burden in one. By addressing His Word to him God reminds man that he is made to be a person, that is to say a being who has his centre in his own self and who therefore aspires for a world which would be in accordance with his aspirations. But dreams and wishes are not sufficient to realise that goal. For He who addresses him is the Creator of all that is real in its infinite extension. Yet this universe in which God has placed us shows no consideration for our personal existence and in its infinite expansion confronts man as an enemy rather than as a friend. While at first sight it may look as though we were able to master this world and to make it subject to our interests, the modern development of science and technology are teaching us that with every further advance we enhance the destructive power of the things of this world. Think of the fatal side-effects of antibiotics and tranquillisers, let alone the menace of atomic energy!

Thus the Word of the Creator confronting us with the incalculable and indomitable immensity of the world He made, reminds us of the lack of meaning to be found in human existence as such. We take it so naïvely for granted that in that tiny closed world to which we normally confine ourselves, we are able to do and to make things by which life is rendered

meaningful and worthwhile; e.g. we may acquire an education, or a fortune, or a good position, and most people will spend a lot of energy and/or money to reach such a goal. But when God confronts us with the overwhelming vastness of the world He made, He reminds us of our ridiculous and insignificant smallness in this world, the insufficiency and the meaninglessness of our 'normal' life is laid bare before us. In comparison with such an unlimited and incomprehensible universe what is accomplished by what we considered a meaningful life?

Thus just as for the Jews in the days of the Baptist so in our days the divine call to Baptism reminds us first of all of the tragic character of our life. As human beings we are simply unable permanently to live this life while ignoring the fact that all its efforts do not really pay off. But as the Word of the Creator the call compels us to admit that the self-centredness of our small and self-contained existence is not a simple delusion. Rather it is grounded in our unwillingnesss openly to face the tragic character of life, notwithstanding the fact that we are instinctively aware of it, and thus in the final analysis it implies a denial of the Creator. Hence our inability effectively to cope with the futility of our existence is God's Judgment. That in the days of John Israel should be in a hopeless political situation was not due to God's inability to rescue His people but rather to their stubborn and superficial belief that their salvation depended on their own cleverness. Similarly when our modern predicament seems to end in the cul-de-sac of atomic self-annihilation, we have to blame our secular humanism and materialism for such an outcome. The very course of events refutes Hegel's contention that our misery is due to the original weakness of our mind, yet that in the centuries to come man's reason and in particular science will reach such heights that eventually by its accomplishments life will be rendered more than worth while.

The Message of Hope

However, while the inescapable character of the divine Judgment lurks behind God's call to Baptism, the message entrusted to the Baptist was not meant simply to confirm what the better portion of the nation sensed instinctively in their anxiety, and what the rest could never completely conceal

from their apprehensive hearts in their superficial hunt for pleasures. By inviting His people to a 'Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins' (Mark 1.4) God intimated that He was offering an escape from the impending catastrophe. Although there was nothing man had to hope for from this world's icy indifference, this was God's world, nevertheless, and in it He was carrying out His plan of redemption. The final act was in sight, God would manifest His purpose by fettering the powers of evil in this world. That is what the announcement of the nearness of the divine Kingdom meant.

But the Word of God that came to the Baptist left also no doubt about the fact that the divine help would not come on man's terms. It was in vain that the Pharisees in those days hoped that God would be moved to save His people, if only most meticulously they kept his Law as they understood it, or that the community at Qumran believed that their rigorous legalism would force God's hands and hasten the day of deliverance. What else were these attitudes but blasphemous contentions that they could ignore God's work in Creation as long as they managed to manipulate their little man-made 'moral universe'? They were satisfied with the correctness of their actions and hence did not care to come to John's Baptism, which to them was but an empty ceremony. Their attitude makes evident how difficult it is for man—even for religious man—to attain to a real comprehension of God's grace. The Jews had witnessed many divine benefits in their history. But to them they were either the logical outcome of what they considered their natural superiority over the rest of the nations, or a kind of merchandise for which they were prepared to pay the price, e.g. a life of austerity and moral rigorism. In either case they failed truly to appreciate the greatness of the donor and the sublime value of the gift.

What makes Baptism relevant for Christians is the fact that it is an efficacious offer of God's grace vouchsafed by the fact that Jesus Himself came to John and was baptised in the Jordan river. This fact not only serves to confirm the origin of the Christian Baptism in the Baptist's eschatological rite but also indicates how it is that Baptism will save from the divine Judgment. The dialogue which according to Matthew Jesus had with the Baptist only makes explicit what is implied in the

descent of the Spirit upon Jesus. It is God's will that the Redeemer should in this manner identify Himself with those to be redeemed and thus make the work of purification His own. Jesus' baptism is an indication of the length to which God's grace goes. It made manifest the contrast between the Jewish nation which was called to make a new start in history in spite of its sins, on the one hand, and Jesus, the 'Righteous One', on the other. There was certainly no compelling reason on God's part to offer this new opportunity except the compassion He felt with them, and His determination to render man the crown of all creatures. The fact that Jesus the Sinless One should demand to be baptised can puzzle those only, who ascribe to the ceremony of Baptism as such a redeeming effect. Such interpretation implies a subtle egotism, however. It is for his own sake as one who is afraid of the eternal damnation that in that case one valuates Baptism. Over against such narrow view of individual existence, Jesus' participation in John's work indicates that its significance lies in the contribution it makes to the execution of God's redemptive purpose. When He asked John to baptise Him Jesus signified that He had His share in the execution of God's final act of redemption. The Saviour is inseparable from Baptism; just as the Christian Baptism is the continuation of John's baptism, so Jesus participates in it both in His earthly ministry and also in His risen life. There are no two baptisms, one for the Jews administered by John, and one for the rest of mankind administered by the Church. The Apostles, too, would baptise Jews after Pentecost. By coming to the Baptist, Jesus reveals the joyous fact that it is to the whole of mankind which seems inevitably doomed to futility and self-annihilation, that God offers an opportunity of living a meaningful life. This they do by identifying the direction of their life with God's will.

Thus Jesus' Baptism provides the assurance that Baptism is efficacious. In Jesus, God has shown that it is not man who cleanses himself, as is the case in the Jewish washings, and in the other baptismal sects and religions of the ancient Near East. Rather God Himself is not only willing to forgive us all that was wrong in our past life but also to endow us with the power to live now a life that is in accordance with God's will.

As far as God is concerned the water Baptism is to be

followed by the Baptism of the Spirit. Just as God indicated through the proclamation of the Baptist that our past sins would not block for us the road into a better future so He promises and makes sure through Jesus' participation that those believing in God's offer may also be freed from the power of sin and that God's new life of the Spirit may be at their disposal. However, no sudden change in our conduct is brought forth by the act of Baptism. Rather in it we are given the assurance that His grace is from now on at our disposal. The door to a new life has been opened to us. But the changed existence will be ours only if and when we enter through it.

Man's Promise

On the part of the person baptised Baptism is therefore primarily a promise, i.e. he is no longer to consider his own goals supreme but rather to subordinate them to the end God has in view with mankind. Three things are implied in that promise. First of all, we are willing to give up our subjectivism by which we regard our own existence as self-sufficient. By identifying Himself with the whole of the Jewish people, Jesus shows that the only true life is one where our personal existence is lived in the context of, and in solidarity with, the rest of mankind. This is so not merely because the fellow-man is that piece of the world without which I could not be truly human—such a view leads to exclusiveness and arbitrary preferences—but also and above all because they need us. The very trust which we put in God's redemptive will in Baptism serves to announce to them that they are in need of the divine purification too. Everything is not well with men. Even their apparent goodness cannot stand the scrutiny of an unbiased conscience.

Secondly, by accepting Baptism we declare our willingness to dedicate our lives to the service of God. This is more than substituting the commandments of the New Testament for the Law of the Old Testament. Rather, instead of seeing our existence confronted with a realm of abstract values and demands issuing from them we join our life with that of Jesus as He works here in this world in His risen power for the redemption of mankind. Apparently Baptism starts a process in which we lose ourselves, for we no longer care whether or

not we are able to assert ourselves over against this world and the open universe. But in fact we have merely shifted the centre of our existence away from our subjectivism and right into the heart of God in Christ, and as a result a new source of life wells up in us.

The newness of our life consists in the first place in a new outlook. Even when our will fails us so that we are not doing what we ought to do, our life differs from that of people without faith by the fact that we acknowledge that our sin is sheer sin, and that we are no longer able to consider good an action merely because everybody acts in that way. Baptism engenders in us a nostalgia for a purer type of life.

Finally, Baptism implies the promise to accept that new outlook irrespective of the cost. Paul reminds us that in His Baptism Jesus engaged in a course of life which eventually would lead to the Cross, and that we identify ourselves with Him in that resolve. What we call success, depends on our willingness to act in conformity with the general course of things that is to say to refrain from applying moral or spiritual standards to the way everybody does things. No wonder therefore that the world reacts with bitterness, when Christians not only insist on their right to be different, but also express thereby their conviction that it is the majority which acts wrongly and foolishly because depriving their lives of spiritual values. Not for every Christian the outcome may be as horrible and painful as it was for Jesus—it is by God's grace that a few are asked to assume vicariously the full load of suffering for the rest of mankind—but we shall certainly not be able to serve God faithfully as long as we are timid or afraid of pain. Were the result of Baptism dependent on man's accomplishment, its fruit might be at the best peace of mind, an assurance that we were better than the common lot of men. But without an objective foundation such a mental state might be a rather hollow comfort. It is only when Baptism is accepted as a divine offer that its full meaning is disclosed to us. The divine appeal that calls people to Baptism reveals the blindness of those who attempt to make life worth while either in existential self-assertion or by means of identification with one's nation or social class. For the Creator reminds us that His infinite universe continues its course without showing regard for man

and his self-chosen goals. Two thousand years hence people will feel pity or contempt for the issues of the 'Cold War' or 'white supremacy', just as we do by studying the wars waged two thousand years ago against Hellenistic kings and barbaric invaders. Natural catastrophes, shortage of food and living spaces and diseases will constantly interfere with man's endeavours, no matter how high may be his scientific accomplishments.

With the new life brought by Jesus, the Saviour shows us what the power is by means of which man can assert himself against the indifference of the cosmos. It is not by considering the universe as the ultimate reality, for as a result of such an attitude the world becomes man's fate and man its slave, but rather by identifying himself in Baptism with the Lord to whom all power is given in heaven and earth, and who thus is able to use the infinity of an open universe for His own plans. John called the Jewish people to the Jordan river, not out of their country but to their country's large stream, thereby indicating that it was for their historical future that God wanted to prepare them. Similarly by finding in Jesus the secret of Baptism, we realise that the fruit of Baptism is to be reaped in this life. God wants us to live in this limitless world in spite of its horrors, in the assurance that not only as the Creator He has them under control but also that through Christ He transforms them into a world in which His will is being done. Thus Christ's presence in Baptism gives us the assurance that we can take a positive attitude towards this world notwithstanding its hostility. He is our Saviour because He enables us to employ and enjoy the things of this world without losing our heart to them. Since our happiness does not depend on our desire to possess them we are no longer fettered by them.

It is from this understanding of God's grace and man's promise in Baptism that the ticklish subject of Infant Baptism is to be treated. It is obvious that those who emphasise the subjective aspect of Baptism only, will reject the application of the ceremony to small children, because they are unable to have faith as the Gospel understands it or to make vows. But if we take seriously the divine origin and function of Baptism, Infant Baptism is no longer an absurdity. While we reject the

Roman Catholic doctrine, by which the efficacy of Baptism is based upon the use of the trinitarian formula, the use of water and the intention to act in the name of the Church, we do so because their view makes light of the personal presence of God who through Christ offers His grace. But we see a good reason for bringing infants to the baptismal font. For it is as members of God's people that parents and ministers are active in the ceremony, and in and through them it is the risen Lord, who acts.

It would be ridiculous, of course, to hold that such an infant would be saved irrespective of the life he lives. Rather it is the Christ who through the teaching of the Church reminds him, as he comes of age, of God's offer made to him and admonishes him to live according to the promise that the Church has made in his name. The indelible character of Baptism is not ascribed to the ceremony but rather to the unchanging redemptive purpose of God proclaimed to him through the baptising Church.

LAYMANSHIP

by The Rev. JOHN MOLE

The following sketch on the role of the *laity* (*a*) in the Church (*b*) in the world is the result of study by a group of laymen. During the course of the study four questions arose: (1) what is the meaning of 'laity'? (2) what is the place of the laity in the Church? (3) what is the meaning of ministry? (4) what is the ministry of the laity? In seeking to formulate a lay self-consciousness, especially *vis-à-vis* the Ministry, we answered these questions as summarised here and came to the general conclusion that laity and ministry are *correlative* and *polar* forces in the life of the whole people of God. The laity is ministered to in the Church by the clergy, and then becomes the ministry to the world. Let us examine these four questions.

1. WHAT IS THE MEANING OF LAITY?

(*a*) 1 Peter 2.9 ('But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people . . .') affords the most pregnant description of the term laity. Admittedly there is a note of lyricism in the turn of phrase, yet the sense of what the *laos* is gains rather than loses thereby. The meaning is enriched if one approaches the sentence liturgically rather than homiletically. No doubt the *laos is* a 'chosen race' by election and covenant, a 'royal priesthood' through its mediatorial position, a 'holy nation' set among the nations of this sinful world (a meaty text indeed for any preacher!). The force of the concept, however, does not lie in the nouns so much as in the adjectives, and in them as taken not separately but collectively, faceting the startling truth '*of God*'. Chosen, royal, holy, of God—the *laos tou theou* is what it is because of its derivation from God and its dependence upon Him. In other words laity is *God-referent*. This is in accord with the whole mood of the *Heilsgeschichte* with its emphasis on divine initiative, that offensive eccentricity of intervention, the lop-sidedness which marks the divine movement in history. First then we must describe laity as *God-referent*.

(*b*) Closely linked with this, and indeed deriving from it, is the second main characteristic of laity: a kind of 'receptivity'. Not only does the *laos tou theou* come into existence because of God but it is sustained by God as it continues to depend on Him and receive from Him. What does it receive? Salvation in its various aspects. Historically one sees the process working out: the *laos* is chosen with Abraham, begotten with Jacob, founded with Moses, nourished and ministered to by God's servants over the years: 'You only have I known of all the families of the earth' (Amos 3.2). The stress is always on the initiative of God and His saving faithfulness. Finally the *laos* is God's own people by reference to Christ and by standing in receipt of His saving benefits.

(*c*) While the people of God have this essential character of 'sub-ordination' there is, however, the implication of a different role: '. . . that you may declare the wonderful deeds . . .' (1 Peter 2.9). There is a ministry of the laity as we shall see presently. This ministry arises out of and after the experience of being established as God's people. Ministry is *subsequent* to laity. This leads to the question of the relationship between 'ministry' and 'laity'. We shall examine the Order of the Church to relate the two. Is the relation antithetical or complementary? Is it the relation of professional and amateur? Does ordination split the *laos* into two races? We shall best understand this if we examine ministry and laity in the Church where the two interlock.

2. WHAT IS THE PLACE OF THE LAITY IN THE CHURCH?

When we study the role and status of the laity in the Church we have to decide the sense of the correlation ministry-laity. What is the relationship between these two modes of churchly activity? We have noted the basic significance of laity as its character of God-reference and receptivity. The concept, ministry, is rather more articulated.

(*a*) One may distinguish in NT three 'moments' in the ordering of the primitive Church: (i) the dynamic order, given by Christ, (ii) the functional moment given by the endowment of the Holy Spirit and (iii) the local-liturgical moment deriving from the ongoing life of the Church.

(i) The dynamic basis of ministry is the *apostolate*, the charge

given by Christ. Here two things must be remembered, however: first, that the Apostles were disciples before they were Apostles, and indeed were Apostles only because of a prior discipleship; second, that apart from any special sense in which there is the office of the Apostolate, there is an apostolicity as the title and heritage of the Church as a whole. Thus while any study of the office of the 'clerical' minister must take account of Apostolic succession *via* the Episcopate, in thinking of the 'lay' minister we may sidestep the bishop-presbyter controversy while still laying claim to apostolic order—he too has been ordered to go into all the world. Indeed, if he is a *disciple* he must be an *apostle*. The basis of the ministry is the charge of Christ to His disciples to go into the world and give as they have received.

(ii) The endowment of the Church by the spectrum of the charismata of the Holy Spirit provides the functional moment in ministry. There is ministry because the Holy Spirit has *empowered* the Church to act in certain ways: e.g. by prophecy, evangelism, teaching, shepherding, etc. Perhaps it is inevitable that a certain 'proprietorial' element creeps in and we find certain individuals specialising in certain of the gifts. The original upsurge of the Spirit, however, was much more 'occasional'—as a certain gift was needed for the right exercise of ministry at a certain time, so it was afforded through the Spirit. In course of time the Church had to define its structure, and certain of its offices were defined by reference to this functional endowment.

(iii) Third is the local-liturgical moment. In the nature of things it is this last which has articulated the structure of the Church in the direction of clericalism. Enough has been said and more will certainly be said regarding the scope and authority of bishop, elder and deacon. We merely remind ourselves, for our purpose, that it was the ongoing life of the Church, liturgical and societary which gave rise to these offices as sanctioned expedients, and not vice versa. The Eucharist demands its celebrant, the Society demands its elder and so on. This reminder of the element of expediency in ministry is not made in disparagement, but in emphasis of the organic connexion between Ministry and Church.

(iv) What is the purpose of this 'ordering' of the Church?

The answer must be, *to minister as Christ came to minister*. Whatever names we apply to the orders of the Church, we are brought back again and again by the word and example of Christ to the work of serving-ministry. In his *Theology of the Laity*[1] Kraemer emphasises the centrality of the diaconate in the thinking of Jesus. Inevitably the word minister has assumed the capital letter and become descriptive of the clerical office, but always there has been the overtone of service, unspecialised, elemental. The washing of the disciples' feet is our Lord's declared pattern of ministry. Christ stands our human categories on their head. His order is not so much to Office as to Ministry. We must temper all the institutionalism of the Church with the spirit of ministry. Thus Christ's disciples are 'sent', 'equipped' and 'organised'—why?—so that they can minister.

(*b*) *The two Ministries*

The question of ordination has tended to professionalise the concept of ministry. Thus for our purpose here we shall use the word 'clergy' to describe the ordained Ministry. Then there is left to the 'people' the possibility of *their* having a type of ministry.

We began by noting that the prime meaning of *laos* was God-referent and receptive. Within this people certain have been set apart. Why? So that they can *minister* to the rest—to the laity. They are deemed fit to do so because they have been themselves in a special way the 'recipients' of the grace of our Lord and are indeed specially ministered unto by Christ.

The Church is the event wherein the love of God is ministered to His people by His clergy. We need to remember at this point, as Kraemer points out, that 'God is concerned about the world. . . . The church is provisional not definitive.' In other words, the ministry of the clergy in the Church is, or should be, the occasion of the subsequent ministry of the *laos* to the world. The former ministry, of the clergy within the Church, does not call for much comment. The ministry of the laity, however, will need careful elucidation. First, however, we consider the place of the layman in the Church.

[1] London, 1958.

(c) What is the role of the layman in the Church?

If the foregoing is adhered to, then the place of the laity in the Church is simply *to be ministered to*. In other words the layman does not have to justify himself in the Church by assisting the clergy. He may of course do so, by fulfilling such offices as lay-reader, deacon, steward, Sunday school teacher and so on. There is nothing wrong in this. Strictly speaking, however, in so doing the layman is abdicating his true function, which is to receive the ministrations of the clergy, and is indeed coming under the umbrella, in some sense, of ordination. The layman proper is he who hears the Word, receives the Sacraments, who is taught, shepherded, helped and governed. The layman's ministry is not in the Church but in the world. Rightly understood the world and its needs constitute his ministry. If we take a thoroughgoing view of ordination we do indeed separate laity and clergy (or ministry). They are indeed poles apart (*polar*, as we said above). It is an unnecessary egalitarianism which would confuse the two. As we shall see, this separation of ministry and laity enhances both and clarifies their separate activities.

(d) The succession of the Ministry

The pattern which now unfolds is this. There is a primary ministry by which the people of God are called into being: ministered unto by God, chosen, covenanted, saved. This is fulfilled in Christ's life and death of suffering ministry. Through His Spirit He ministers still to those who need Him, and they, in their turn, minister to others. The Church's order is a kind of liturgical diagram of this. Ordained clergy, by ministry and administry, lay upon 'people' the charge of ministering in their turn. Ministry and laity is the polarity of the Church. As we have 'freely received' as laity so we have 'freely to give' as His ministers.

One might express this by saying that there is a charge of ministry laid upon every member of the Church. It is really the sphere of service which differentiates the different ministries. That there is a ministry which the clergy have to perform for the rest of the Church does not preclude the rest of the Church from having a ministry; rather is it the means of initiating, through the laity, a 'second ministry'—to the world.

Discussion on the subject of ministry is often pre-occupied with the status and office of the *minister*, as a person, rather than with the study of the nature of the *activity of ministry*. This is not grave, perhaps, within the sphere of the Church where long tradition has laid down a kind of tacit behaviour-pattern for the ordained ministry. For the *lay* minister, however, who ministers in the world outside the Church, there is little in the way of tradition to guide him. He is breaking fresh ground in a bewildering new world. A careful study, therefore, of what the term ministry means will be necessary before we can answer the fourth and most important question. Evidently one cannot arrive at the full meaning of ministry by analysis, yet it is helpful to describe some of the attributes which are involved. Here, of course, the qualities of the Ministry of Christ are normative.

3. WHAT IS THE MEANING OF 'MINISTRY'?

One is familiar with the derivation of *diakonos* as waiter, servant. As characterised by Christ, what does this term imply for the layman who has to be a *diakonos* in the world? One may elicit certain characteristics of ministry as follows.

(1) Ministry is *other-referent*

The waiter who brings one's coffee is concerned, as waiter, not with himself but primarily with (*a*) the management and (*b*) the customer; the nature of his activity is other-referent. So it was with Jesus as He conveyed the Father's love to needy men. He was concerned to do the will of Him who had sent Him, and He was the servant of those who brought their needs to Him. One finds the same pattern in the feeding of the 5000 and in the final struggle in Gethsemane. His charge to us is: 'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you' (John 20.21).

(2) Ministry is *inversionary*

In the term ministry there is implied also a revaluation of status and office. As Jesus washes the disciples' feet He teaches that the humbleness of service is the true dignity. We speak of Christ in terms of the threefold office (prophet, priest, king); in point of fact, however, Jesus inverted these terms by applying to them the constraint of ministry. To call Him Prophet,

Priest and King is valuable as an ascription of moral and spiritual supremacy. It would probably be more accurate, however, to invert the term, and call Him Word, Offering and Subject (cf. Kraemer), for this is the sense of His ministry. Nor is this to be thought of as temporary or 'probationary' with the Ascension and Session coming as a kind of promotion. It is '*this same Jesus*' who is now and will be what He was, a minister. Christ is Prophet because He is Word, Priest because of His self-offering, Lord because He was subject to all.

(3) Ministry is *derivative*

We do not *initiate* ministry. It is rather a response to something given. Christ Himself was sent. We are not expected—or authorised—to go beyond the limits of what we have received. If one is puzzled in a certain situation in the complex secular world as to what one should do to fulfil one's ministry, the way out is not to rack one's brains (or one's body) to create an answer. One has rather to look to our own received experience of grace: to see how God has ministered to us in some parallel case, or, more impersonally, to note some comparable occasion in our Lord's life and teaching. When one grows weary in well-doing, the solution does not lie in iron discipline or frantic ideologising, but in being ministered unto at a deeper level.

(4) Ministry is *authoritative*

At the same time there is authority in ministry. Evidently this is not power as the world understands it. It is the authority of him who has been commissioned—an uncomfortable authority, which constrains rather than elevates. The clerical ministry of the Church recognises its divine mandate in various ways. That same authority inheres in the ministry which the laity exercise in the world.

(5) Ministry is *charismatic*

Ministry is attended by the gifts of the Holy Spirit. At the first these gifts, as we have noted, were more occasional than 'official' and permanent. Thus the brethren prophesied to Paul at a certain moment in a certain context; they healed, evangelised, shepherded as the need arose. To fulfil our

ministry in any particular situation the Holy Spirit supplies the gift needed. Here one would not wish to be disingenuous or misleading. Because grace-gifts and 'natural' gifts overlap there will be some specialisation of function even here. The lone Christian may, moreover, feel that his particular portion of whatever grace-gift is needed is inadequate. We must be very careful here not to judge as the world judges, by success or acclaim. To take for example the preaching function of the ministry, when the charismatic endowment is superadded to a natural eloquence one can expect a 'good sermon'; here the activity is rather specialised. What of the unfortunate layman who (like Moses before him, be it noted) is 'slow of speech' but who is put into a situation where he must speak a word for the Lord? He need not worry because he does not do it well (as it seems to him). The Holy Spirit does not make people 'good' preachers, 'good' healers and so on; rather does He give them a 'general' endowment of the *Spirit of ministry*; the details of the occasion then define the function more specifically.

(6) Ministry is *personal*

What is the purpose of this ministry, understood in human terms? If we are to minister to people we must consider their nature and needs. The basic human need must be 'to be human'. What does this mean? There are, of course innumerable definitions of man. We choose, perhaps arbitrarily, the notion that man is essentially 'rational' or objective (cf. MacMurray in, e.g. *The self as Agent*, *Conditions of Freedom*, *Interpreting the Universe*). In every sphere of life man behaves rationally—or ought to behave rationally. This is not to be thought of in a *rationalistic* way. Rationality, rightly understood, is the search for valid objective relationships, for mutuality. In this sense one's ministry consists in behaving objectively towards the world, other people, God. Christ's ministry is the proof that the basis of the cosmos is an activity of objectivity (Creation) aimed at mutuality (fellowship).

(7) Ministry is the activity proper to *faith*

Without faith it would be nonsensical to live a life of ministry. At most one might allow a certain degree of disinterest in one's actions. In general, however, ministry is the expression of

faith, its behaviour-pattern. Opposed to it is the egocentricity of sin and fearfulness. The ministry of all God's servants bears this character. Not that we should aim merely to be *busy* like Martha. Like Mary we must derive our ministry from faith —from being in touch with Christ.

(8) Summary

Having given this tentative analysis of the term ministry, may we now find a synonym for it? Evidently Christian love is the same activity, and as long as it is seen through its relationship to ministry in general and the primary ministry of Christ in particular we may use it of the life of the Christian. Ministry consists in loving one's neighbour because one is loved and ministered to by God. Thus understood Luther's injunction to 'be a Christ to one's fellow men' loses any offence it may have. Ministry is the behaviour proper to the laity.

4. WHAT IS THE MINISTRY OF THE LAITY?

In the light of what we have been saying this question answers itself: the ministry of the laity is simply *to minister*, i.e. to bring into all the alien structures of human affairs this new behaviour-pattern of ministry. Along these lines there may be suggested a key principle for Christian behaviour in the world which would avoid both the errors of the Catholic and the Protestant social ethic, viz. (i) false clericalism and (ii) a false secularism.

(i) The catholic tradition of social ethics has never exhibited that inertia in social affairs which has afflicted some of the more quietist sections of the Church. Catholicism and 'action' spring jointly to the tongue in this connexion. Such activism however carries with it the temptation of clericalism or 'paternalism'. One thinks of the medieval synthesis as the classic example of a Church-world relationship which in more homely connexions would be called meddling. The Church-world relationship must be interpreted in terms of ministry.

(ii) In reacting so violently against the clerical stress on Vocation, Luther tended to place the stress on the particular job of the individual as being the sphere where his obedience was called for. The danger in this is that it places the economic sphere above judgment—since *whatever* is one's work, therein

lies one's duty. This is to yield too much to the contingency of circumstances. There is *one* vocation for every Christian: to minister.

How does this work out in practice?

The practice of ministry

Daily the world presents the Christian with 'agenda' which he has to carry through. There are personal relationships, economic questions to do with work and money, home life and marriage, problems of community life, political affairs, international problems. If one studies each of these separately to educe a Christian set of answers, one has given away too much in doing so, and merely achieves a kind of mellower version of the answers which the world has already given. The Christian answer to any and all of these problems is always the same: to minister. In other words, as laymen, our responsibility consists in bringing the pattern of ministry, as characterised somewhat along the lines we have suggested in part 3 above, into the intransigent spheres of the world's activities. There are no ideal solutions, often there is no solution at all which is, humanly speaking, worthy of the name. Yet the Christian is never thwarted, for there is no situation in which he may not practise his ministry. As he has received the grace of God's ministry in Church so he goes out into the world to be its minister. If Luther was right that because we have been baptised we are priests, perhaps it is still more true that because we are laymen we must minister.

ARCHITECTURE AND LITURGY

by F. R. STEVENSON

THE word liturgy in the New Testament seems to express a thing already complete in itself, not requiring association with architecture. The minister, the people, the bread and the wine, are the essential association of living souls and earthly elements. The Christian temple built in three days is an edifice not made with hands. The Christian worshipping, fulfilling the duty of liturgy, is a person not of this world and only in this world for a time. He treads this earth lightly, looking for the appearing of His Lord to build a new earth, and introduce a state of things where human dimensions of length, breadth and height become something else and infinitely greater, associated with the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. The New Testament uses the word liturgy in the context of expectation of this development which can only be described in language seeming to exclude the thought that a building fit to house this Christian worship can be made with hands. The word church never means the house itself. It means the people, the living stones out of which the temple not made with hands is built. Thus what we call the apostolic age would not have thought it an affectation, when recently an Anglican presbyter, introducing from his church on Saturday evening television a programme for the next day to consist of the liturgy for that day, said, 'This building is not the church, but the Church meets here.'

Architecture and liturgy are not associated terms in early Church tradition. And today some who have returned to that tradition through the revival of biblical eschatological theology go so far as to feel a distrust of the architectural church. They see it as the place from which the common man justifiably has fled and to which they find it hard to believe that Our Lord will at His appearing call the multitudes as to His holy mount of Zion.

But let us look at the matter first on a lower plane of earthly experience and see what the association of architecture with liturgy common to so many ages of the Church consists in.

We find then that it is virtually an unavoidable thing. No act of cultus can take place without an environment and it is a recurring fact of human history that this environment takes the form of an enclosure where people gather round the priest to identify their actions with his, undisturbed by scenes or activities capable of distracting attention from the solemn task in hand. Even the high places we read about in the history of Israel's backslidings were a created environment of this kind, so much so that they had to be destroyed before the thoughts of evil worship they evoked could be put out of mind. Today the anthropologist, with his world-wide survey of cultus-forms and with assistance from the archaeologist in reconstructing these forms as used by vanished peoples, confirms this universal trend to construct a special environment for worship. And although the language of the New Testament on the one hand and on the other the fact that events of Graeco-Roman history obliterated the churches of the first few centuries of Christianity induce in us the sense that early Christians were careless of their liturgical environment, a likelihood remains that this inborn sense of environment and the power to create it did in fact produce during these first centuries a liturgical architecture. This, we may assume, bore witness in some way to the rightness of the Christian liturgy, just as the high places of backsliding Israel had borne witness to wrongness.

Archaeologists will not allow us to think of, for example, neolithic monuments as high places in that horror-struck and bloodstained sense, yet we all know people who nevertheless feel as they inspect such groups of standing stones, a mysterious permeation of evil, witnessing to a religion in which God stood altogether apart from man—or men stood apart from God—where irreconcilables met, maybe in ecstasy, in the glory of the midsummer sun, but without any shared eschatological objective. This may seem much to deduce from a ring of standing stones, yet to the spiritually aware there is a language which such places speak, and thus also a language which Christian places of worship speak, of the nature of the cultus for which they were created.

Thus it is likewise possible to sense the character of Christian worship from age to age by visiting the buildings in which it took place, quite apart from the fact that for the most part

even the earliest remaining and simplest Christian churches are capable of much archaeological interpretation leading to more scientific conclusions. This scientific study in the hands of exponents of the modern liturgical movement has indeed built up a *prima facie* case for a close and conscious connexion between liturgy and architecture from the period of the earliest discovered remains. Sensitive study of a neolithic temple has its counterpart in the undoubted feeling of kinship with vanished generations of Christians which most of us have when we stand in the nave of a tiny missionary basilica in some outpost of Christian history and looking toward the place where the holy table stood know that there day by day Christ fed his people with the same heavenly food we ourselves meet together to partake of.

If then there is this recognisable association when we look back, it can be argued also to have been present when the buildings in question were put up, and it is indeed obvious both in basilican churches and those of other forms that at least the available space was being consciously arranged and adjusted to meet the practical needs of the liturgy. It is likewise clear—even the name basilica speaks of this—that an attempt was everywhere being made to create a building of regal character, transposing the imagery of earthly royalty into that of the heavenly King. Cold water has been thrown on the theory that when Christianity became the official religion of the Empire, basilicas were joyfully taken over from pagan use to become ready-made churches, but no one has disproved that the resulting splendour of such basilicas built from the fourth century onwards was the work of triumphant artists who through Christianity itself gave the design techniques of their time a new meaning. Their greatest triumph was their discovery in the altar and sanctuary an entirely new and utterly transcendent architectural climax: no articles of furniture, no imperial throne or judges' tribune found in the civil use of such places could compare with it. From the moment that discovery was made—and who knows how early it was?—the successive triumphs of the domed sanctuaries of Byzantium, the lofty vaulted apses of the Gothic age in the North and the equally climactic forms of the Baroque churches of central Europe were a foregone conclusion. Given the

techniques the primeval instinct of man the creature to make a house for the God who visits him would have forced the creation of such buildings, even against theological and liturgical teaching: 'Lord let us make here three tabernacles, one for Thee and one for Moses and one for Elias.' Peter spoke for many when he said these words, and it was not merely a tent for Jesus the man, his companion and master, Peter had in mind; but a place to contain the transfigured Christ, where this wonderful spectacle could be perpetuated and made available for all to see. Through many interpretations of what actually happens in the liturgy this sense that Christ is really present in His risen majesty has remained firm and with it a desire to build churches as worthy of this 'heavenly guest' (as Grundtvig called Him) as human ingenuity could accomplish.

On the lower plane of human creation as distinct from the higher plane of what God wills to be created, we can thus form one or two conclusions about the architectural environment of liturgy. First, it seems to have roots in man's spiritual instinct whether or not he has had any revelation of God. Secondly, it receives new impulses when God by stages reveals himself to man. Thirdly, it is readily associated with the spiritual realities of liturgy and is capable of attaining excellence through this association.

Resuming consideration of the higher plane of what God Himself wills concerning liturgical building, can we say that any temples or churches built with hands are or have been His will? Here we must go back to the Old Testament, where unless a very extreme attitude of reserve is adopted towards the tabernacle narrative there is evidence that this remarkable little sanctuary was itself a revelation of God's will for Israel. The story of its design and construction is unlike anything likely to have resulted merely from a human desire to build a sanctuary. Nomads have always been able to make luxurious tents and to place inside them surprisingly lavish furniture, but the monumentally heavy construction of the Mosaic tabernacle—the weight of beaten gold alone that went into its adornment and that of its furniture being, it seems, over two tons—is surely the result of some quite unusual impulse to glorify God. Adding to this reflection some study of the cultus itself, described in the same text; its confident monotheism, its

assertion that once built the tabernacle became God's dwelling place visible by the *shekinah*, it seems clear that here was a case the first so far as we know, where liturgical architecture followed a divinely appointed pattern. There are likewise confident statements, as of matters of fact, that the designers Bezaleel and Aholiab were inspired specifically and directly to do the work and ensure a divine quality throughout the building and all its parts. Any remaining incredulity felt by a creative artist who reads the Mosaic account must vanish when he realises the revolutionary basis of the design, resting on symbols not the prevailing imagery. Finally this whole desert sanctuary is capable of typological interpretation beyond all possibilities inherent in other houses of God of that age, and in this seems to lie a suggestion that in its general lines at least this God prescribed arrangement of buildings and parts, of furniture and even of garments has an application to the worship of the new Israel when the time came for that to supersede the types of the Law.

It would take long to follow this theme through the subsequent temple-building undertakings and projects—David's wish and his son Solomon's fulfilment of it taking place under God's judgment of David; Ezekiel's astonishing detailed specification for a building still more glorious with its distinct flavour of other-worldliness; the urge to restore displayed in the work of Ezra and Nehemiah—all these circumstances and events seem to point to a relation between what these devoted men were doing and what God wanted them to do. Even the perverted purpose of Herod's final restoration of the remains of all their work is not without its implication that a true restoration was possible, that a return from backsliding would still have brought about a true fulfilment of the arrival of Israel with their tabernacle, to build their present temple in the promised land.

We may observe that it was this piece of liturgical architecture which Our Lord denounced when the apostles admired it, as though it carried in its precious stones the marks of falsehood, the self-righteousness of an Israel finding its feet in the world of men instead of the signs of a people withdrawn from that world and waiting for their Messiah. Our Lord does not denounce the temple idea. Indeed He associates Himself with

it and says of that very temple that He will rebuild it in three days. The apostle explains that Jesus spoke of His own body, but it is His body of which we are all members, in ourselves and in our congregations, in our worship and especially in our central liturgical act of breaking bread in which, as He demonstrated at Emmaeus, we see and know Him.

We may be allowed to form a conclusion here about architecture and liturgy on this higher plane of God's will and His prescriptions of it, to add to those formed in merely considering what men have done about it. It is a simple conclusion. As the liturgy is an expectant thing, expecting the wonder of God's sacramental presence where the two or three are gathered together—indeed expecting beyond that the *parousia*, the appearing, the *epiphaneia*, the manifestation of Jesus—so the building itself must carry the marks of this Messiah-consciousness. It must speak of God's coming glory and not of Man's present glory. Not even the Church's glory will do because the Church is in her widowhood and her only permitted glory is that which speaks of her reunion with her Lord, looking forward to the heavenly banquet even while the sacramental presence is reverently housed and as reverently enjoyed as the earnest of the heavenly inheritance.

Messiah-consciousness stamped the whole design of the Tabernacle, but it was a characteristic hard for the uninitiated to admire. We have no evidence anywhere that the tabernacle was copied. Archaeology has revealed the remains of many a temple built by the peoples who surrounded Israel whose names we read in Joshua and the Books of Judges, but none of them follows the Israelite pattern: rather they belong to the type we associate with the Hittites in the north and the Egyptians to the south, deriving from the tomb-places of ancestor-worship, which take us back to prehistory largely without evidence of progress in revelation. Such temples were glorious to behold and tempted the Israelites to envy while the Israelitic tabernacle seemed to unknowing contemporaries merely pathetic. Yet the truth was only that the tabernacle looked forward, not back. It was essentially not static, either in visible essence or in inner meaning. It stood dynamically between the children of Israel and the promised land as the token of that promise just as the desert around was the token of hindrance.

The analogy with the spiritual Israel is clear and to Jewish Christians learned in the Law, possessed of apostolic discernment enabling them to see how much more important were the claims which the wilderness period of Israel's history had on their attention than the synagogue period from which they themselves had come, there must have occurred the idea of applying the principles of the tabernacle to the problem of designing the Christian sanctuary. Though fragmentary, evidence of this application is impressive. The candlestick is mentioned in Rev. 2 as a symbol of central importance to members of the church in Ephesus. There is a tradition that such an article of furniture was found in mediterranean churches of the sixth century, possibly under Hebraic influence, but examples of medieval date survive here and there in northern countries belonging wholly to Gentile Christendom. Again, the elaborate use of Hebraic elements in Paul's typological expositions shows that they were part of a habit of Jewish-Christian thought about the relation of Levitical to Apostolic ordinances. At least we know that Paul expected immediate comprehension, as of first principles, when speaking of the analogy between the ministry of the high priest in the *tabernacle* and the high priestly office of Christ, and this can lead us to suppose that Christians of that day pictured Our Lord fulfilling such a ministration before the throne of God as before the mercy-seat. To those Churches today which apply the same analogy to the eucharistic celebrant—presbyter or bishop—identifying him as a sacrificial priest both with Aaron and with Christ, there is from time to time a trend towards tabernacle precedent in the formation and arrangement of, at least, the celebrant's own part of the building. The nineteenth century was particularly notable for this among the sacramentalist movements in European countries. In the cases of Churches which do not in the same way accept the priestly characteristic of what the celebrant does there is somewhat less urge to seek a foothold in this admittedly difficult and partly obscure precedent. The same unfortunate lack of records from apostolic times which robs the one party of convincing documentary proof of the continuance of a sacrificial Aaronic priesthood among men under apostolic authority, also prevents us from knowing how closely early Christian buildings conformed

to Hebrew prescription. In the nineteenth century itself the most generally-held theory was that the fourth-century take-over of basilicas marked the point where the architectural church took form. Another was the 'schola' theory, also arguing a late date for this essential happening. The standard work on architectural history in English, Banister Fletcher's *History of Architecture on the Comparative Method*, still used in our architectural education, propounds both theories largely as though Roman secular uses of buildings determined the architectural pattern of the Christian liturgy.

Since the nineteenth century other theories have been advanced and among liturgists today there is respect for a more synthetic statement that Jewish, Jewish-Christian, Greek and Roman elements combined in various ways from apostolic times onwards to produce the pattern which emerges not as a new thing but as something already mature in various basilican remains from the fourth century onwards.

Whether or not these fourth-century churches possessed the quality of Messianic expectation is difficult to say, just as the quality itself is difficult to define. Certainly they shared with the Jewish tabernacle one quality important to consideration of that question: their greatest splendour was indoors, culminating in a holy of holies where gold, precious stones and bright colour were marshalled ready to receive the Christian Messiah. The portrayal of the Pantocrator on the ceiling overhead—a daring step to take; too daring, as the iconoclastic controversy shows—indicated how close were these Christians to the Messianic hope of being presented before the throne of God by the Son of God at His coming. Yet we must also admit the likelihood of attempts at external grandeur, especially when towers and domes came into use. This again poses the question whether it was the exterior, palace-like glory of Herod's temple which contained a quality of offence which the tabernacle at the other end of this scale had avoided; and then the question whether it follows from this that monumental exteriors are the particularly dangerous element in church design, where human pride displays itself to prevent the whole structure from proclaiming God's glory, the glory of Christ the King.

To take an outstanding example associated with a notorious outbreak of human pride in the rise of the Papacy in the

sixteenth century, St. Peter's in Rome has seemed to many to speak of the Church's glory *here and now*, possibly *there and then*, more than it does of any Messianic expectation. It is the cathedral of the *civitas dei* already built on earth, not that of the city of God still to come. If this opinion is true—and it has been shared by many Roman Catholics with strong ties of allegiance to St. Peter's as an episcopal see: indeed propounded by one: Pugin—then this must mean that there *are* dangers in so glorifying the liturgy, in so glorifying its celebrant, through an architectural setting of such monumental form, that Our Lord's own glory is obscured. That is, of course, a view easy to take when contemplating the Roman Church from a Reformation standpoint. It may, therefore, be necessary in fairness to point out that a similar glorification of what one critic of the Reformation has called the 'exegetical papacy' has also been possible. The Reformation's process of decentralisation may mean that no simple protestant counterpart of St. Peter's exists, but the smaller severer versions of this great Roman basilica which appeared in the streets and squares of protestant Europe chiefly in Georgian times seem sometimes to err in the same direction. The cathedral of Berlin comes to mind as an example, larger than most, though here one is face to face with the sudden way in which the commotions of civil society can reverse the intentions of everyone concerned. This arrogant building has become an expression of fortress-like strength appropriate to the present role both of protestant and Roman Catholic life and liturgy in that beset city. Possibly in a similar way St. Peter's was more eloquent of its true character when, during World War II, it stood out as a refuge from the tumult and human tyranny with which it was surrounded. This, we may observe, was a function of which Herod's temple was incapable through its hierarchy's total lack of sense of God's judgments. Thus under siege it became not a spiritual refuge but a seat of physical resistance and Josephus describes scenes there which seem to speak only of pathetic loyalty to a place, not to God who had indeed hidden His face from the desolation of Zion so long foretold.

Consideration of parallel experiences between Israel after the flesh and Israel after the spirit leads us therefore to conclude that through its form and appearance a church may share too

much in man's sense of the monumental to express true Godliness. Possibly a better way to put this thought in its application to Christian churches as distinct from the Jewish temple is to say that God's immanence may be so much expressed that His transcendence is obscured—a thing of which theology can be as guilty as architecture.

So far we lack complete evidence to show, as Pugin tried to do, that certain prescribed architectural forms are Christan and others pagan: that, in other words, the whole range of Renaissance churches from St. Peter's in Rome to the Kirk of Fochabers in Scotland, are a pagan commodity, a Herodian imposition upon pure Mosaic tradition. The Pugins, of course, were the pre-eminent advocates of Gothic as the Christian style of architecture. To Pugin the younger the cathedrals of the Île de France particularly were so eloquent of heavenly-mindedness with their soaring vaults and atmosphere of being miraculously lifted off the earth that they seemed to satisfy the whole of his ruthlessly searching perfectionism. He was one of a generation important to us today, for those who followed him in Scotland in the later part of the nineteenth century, Gillespie Graham, Chalmers and Rowand Anderson, though less perfervid, spread far and wide the same assumption. In strange alliance, the Church Service Society on the Presbyterian side of Scottish churchmanship and on the Anglican side the patrons and trustees of newly built episcopal churches seem to say that pure 'decorated' Gothic of the fourteenth century reproduced in the nineteenth perfectly expresses the rediscovered Anglican Catholic ethos, and as perfectly the rediscovered eucharistic aims of Knox. Certainly we have not heard the last of Victorian Gothic, with its truly great emotional appeal.

Possibly Northern Gothic was in a sense the culmination of the basilican idea in which sacred space, the sacred enclosure, the enshrinement of the 'real presence' strongly partook of ancient Jewish-Christian feeling. The pointed arch is itself of eastern origin. In Gothic churches both of fourteenth and nineteenth centuries, the logical structural assertions of Greece and Rome gained greater mastery through use of the pointed arch than could have been possible without it. This was created a subtle blend of spatial illusion and fluidity of structural form, in which the apparently feather-light building stood over the

holy table and its jewelled and gilt embellishments as a great tent might. Here was a tabernacle (at least in the sense used by Peter) in which the consecrated bread could repose worthily as consisting of separated essence and accidents for the very structure spoke a mystic language in which reality and metaphysics seemed to make some similar separation of themselves and yet union with each other. Messianic may be the wrong adjective to apply to the Gothic cathedrals but at least the sense of *shekinah*—a visible tangible sign of God's presence there and then while the liturgy was in progress and after its daily conclusion—*that* was *there* as it may not have been in any previous age of Christianity. Thus, as Pugin saw, liturgy and architecture had assimilated each other. Yet, as we perhaps can see though he could not, a supervention had occurred of confused eschatological doctrine of death and purgatory, of individual salvation through death, not corporate salvation through Christ's change of the living and the dead. This was capable of destroying—and at the end of the middle ages did destroy—what might have been a final and convincing association of our two subjects in Gothic forms sublime beyond all that the middle ages themselves achieved.

So far as the Reformation contributes thought to our problem we can say that while it did not return to clear eschatology, it placed emphasis on personal spirituality. And though there ensued a certain neglect of temples made with hands in any architectural style, this spirituality did communicate itself to Reformation architecture. Thus George Hay describes fine buildings deeply spiritual in character all over a forgotten Scotland and others have described even finer churches in Holland and Scandinavia. What then went wrong? Surely it was what happened behind the ecclesiastical scene in the incipient secularisation of all architecture, even drawing with it a secularisation of liturgy, all in analogy with Imperial Rome and where palace and forum came first, temples second.

What then of today? Secularisation continues with an emphasis still on the Reformation and the counter-Reformation humanistic content. Clergy, Protestant and Roman, sit on town councils and vote money for schools and hospitals, for waterworks and the resurfacing of streets, but have to scrape and beg for money to build churches. Today's monumental

buildings are those of physical welfare and wellbeing, from hospitals to power stations. Where then are Aholiab and Bezaleel? When not engaged on designing secular buildings they are doing their best with churches reduced in scale. In Scotland, Bezaleel is building a church of pathetic poverty on one side of the street for one Christian group while Aholiab struggles on the other side for another. Each resorts to tricks to make the cost-budget cover real needs. The one church has a permanent holy place but a convertible holy of holies; the other a permanent holy of holies which can be shut off from the holy place while the latter is temporarily unholy. This device is not to hide God from the unholy but to veil His presence from the holy, who would rather not on that kind of occasion know He was there. Abroad things seem a little better and particularly in Germany and Switzerland designers are producing churches of fine quality in a sort of re-birth of early Christian simplicity, frankly accepting a minority status in the community. These are wholly in tune with the parallel work of liturgists, Roman, Lutheran and Reformed, who are seeking to recapture the form and content of the early Christian eucharist, with emphasis on the time when Christians were few rather than many. Here is a phenomenon holding out some hope of true revival in both spheres when Christians again become a multitude. If after seeing our own new churches this state of architectural and liturgical preparedness is still obscure, we can probably dispel that feeling by a short continental tour. If some still feel that Victorian Gothic held the complete solution and that even the best work of today cannot compare with it, they must realise that it has suffered a double eclipse, for even the many examples still standing are falling into disuse and losing their hold on church-people's affection. Gothic has fallen in some sense before the advance of town planning. Fine churches, both of medieval Gothic and the nineteenth-century version, stand empty in the city centre, while in the suburbs churches built inevitably in another architectural idiom—for the medieval and the Victorian craftsman have alike vanished, the one as dead as the other—are slowly becoming the recognised sacred architecture of this age.

The needs of today are Israelitic to a degree which has not occurred perhaps, since Moses. If churches are not mobile,

church membership is and the spirit of the age is well nigh as restless as that of a nomadic society. This could be fruitful ground for the Christian sower and indeed the prevailing urge to teach Christ's total sovereignty has much in common with the Mosaic form of theocracy transcending restlessness and bringing it to appropriate order.

All might yet be well with liturgy and with its architecture. Bezaleel and Aholiab are there and only need to be given their opportunity at the word of Moses and Aaron. But where is Moses and where is Aaron? In the tents of discussion, in tents pitched for the assimilation of differences—the priests and the Levites at variance with no man as judge for none can name their Moses or their Aaron while God's threatening judgments are unheeded.

Had such a situation followed the giving of the law to ancient Israel which thing would have happened first? The earth opening to swallow up the children of disobedience? Or, the sterner judgment of a people turning away again to worship a golden calf, in final apostasy?

THE PROBLEM OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW

by The Rev. GABRIEL HEBERT

For whom, and with what special purpose, was St. Matthew's Gospel written? The thesis of this paper is, that it was written after the Fall of Jerusalem by a Jewish Christian for the Great Church, which by then was predominantly Gentile, with the special purpose of bringing to Gentile Christians the moral and spiritual teaching which Jerusalem had preserved and which they sorely needed.

One problem of Matthew is this: that the Evangelist, while reproducing with great care the testimony of the sources which he accepts as authoritative (namely, Mark, Q, and M which contained the tradition of the Church of Jerusalem over which St. James had presided), does not attempt to reconcile them. As we shall see, it is hard to think that if our Lord said that 'till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished' (5.18), He could also have said 'It is not that which enters the mouth that makes a man unclean, but that which comes out of his mouth is what makes him unclean' (15.11, cf. Mark 7.15), since this saying repeals the whole of Leviticus 11, on unclean foods. Again, if He commanded His disciples to do and observe all that was laid down by the Scribes who sat on Moses' seat (23.1-3), how could He have so trenchantly criticised the Tradition of the elders as leading in actual cases to breach of the Fifth Commandment (15.1-9, cf. Mark 7.5-13)? Here the synoptic problem comes alive; our Evangelist, it seems, is faithfully following sources which disagree with one another.

Another aspect of the problem of this Gospel is that it teaches a 'futurist' eschatology. Such an eschatology is indeed common to all the synoptists, but it is more strongly emphasised in Matthew, where we are continually being reminded of the Advent of the Lord to judge mankind; 'Many are called, but few are chosen' (22.14) is a very typical saying.[1] This emphasis

[1] This is a remark of G. Bornkamm on p. 229 of his very valuable essay, 'Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium' in *The Background of the New*

on a coming Judgment was the message of John the Baptist; and in this Gospel only the proclamation of the coming Kingdom is expressed by the Baptist and our Lord in the same words (3.2 and 4.17). Hence Bultmann, at least in his earlier work, held that in principle His mission was identical with that of the Baptist, and the 'Shift of the Ages' did not appear till after His resurrection. Does Matthew then hold a different eschatology from that of the greater part of the New Testament? We shall have to examine this question in the light of the evidence; we shall see that the high christology which Matthew shares with Mark and Q is borne out by much else which proclaims an 'inaugurated eschatology'.

The problem is, How are we to 'place' all this?—having in mind the distressed and scattered condition of the Jewish Christians after the Fall of Jerusalem; and having in mind that our Evangelist was a Jewish Christian himself, and that he would be aware of the peril of antinomianism to which the Pauline churches and Gentile Christians in general were exposed.

THE GENTILE CHURCHES

Gregory Dix in his *Jew and Greek*, pp. 27-60, gave us a most valuable sketch of the development of the Church from the earliest days in Jerusalem. It had inherited the Old Testament faith in the living God; it believed in Jesus as the Messiah promised in the OT, and it understood the new experience of what it called 'the Spirit' in the light of the Spirit who had spoken in the OT prophets, so that it knew itself to be living the life of the New Covenant.[1] This was what made the difference between these Jewish Christians and all non-Christian Jews. Therefore, when the New-Covenant-life appeared among Gentile converts also, in the crucial case of Cornelius at Caesarea, St. Peter could do no other than recognise the fact (Acts 11.17); and James, Peter and John could do no other than recognise the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles to baptism at Antioch, when they had

Testament and its Eschatology, ed. Davies and Daube. I am indebted to this essay at a number of points where no acknowledgment is made in the footnotes. As I was living in Australia when this paper was written, I had not yet been able to see his *Jesus von Nazareth* (Urban Bücher, Kohlhammer), nor the English translation published by Hodder and Stoughton.

[1] Dix, pp. 27-28.

satisfied themselves that the Gospel which St. Paul was proclaiming there was the same Gospel which they themselves believed (Gal. 2.1-10).[1] When the controversy of Paul and Peter arose (Gal. 2.11ff), it was because word had come from James that the Christians in Judaea were in serious peril from the unbelieving Jews, of riots and massacres (for *tous ek peritomēs*, 2.12, must mean according to Pauline usage 'the Jews',[2] and not as in Acts 11.2 'the circumcision-party in the Church')[3]; and Peter and the others judged it wisest, as a temporary expedient, to hold separate church-suppers-and-eucharists for the Jewish and the Gentile Christians.[4] But Paul saw this as a most dangerous precedent, because it was a betrayal of principle. The principle which he stated was the common ground between Peter and himself, namely that a man is made right with God not by keeping the Law but by faith of Messiah Jesus (2.16); this had been the basis from the beginning. Therefore the Council at Jerusalem, when it met, could do no other than open the door to the Gentile mission, laying down only four rules which might make it possible for Gentiles to share in the life of some predominantly Jewish local church; for this was the immediate problem.[5]

Faith in Messiah Jesus who had been crucified and the messianic Spirit came before the keeping of the Law. It was a Gospel of freedom (Gal. 5.1), parallel to the freedom of Jesus when He went to the 'publicans and sinners'. And so St. Paul saw the Christian ethic not as an acquisition of merit by keeping the Law, but as the fruit of the Spirit; love was the 'fulfilment' of the Law (Gal. 5.13-14, 22f).

But the Corinthians soon showed what the practical result could be, among Gentile converts who had not the Jewish moral discipline behind them. 'Love God and do what you will', they said in effect: 'all things are lawful', and Christians could join in a feast in a pagan temple (1 Cor. 8.10), believing that the meat which they were eating was good meat, for 'the

[1] Dix, pp. 35-36. [2] cf. Rom. 4.12, Col. 4.11.

[3] I cannot accept Munck's contention in *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* that there were no Jewish-Christian 'Judaisers'.

[4] Dix, pp. 41-46.

[5] The historical order of events assumed in this paragraph is that which Wilfred Knox argued for and defended, in sharp contrast with the historical scepticism of M. Dibelius in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* and of John Knox in *Chapters in the Life of Paul*.

earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof' (10.26). Other instances of 'Christian freedom' were for a man to cohabit with his stepmother (5.1-2), to go to law with other Christians (6.14), even to commit fornication in pagan temples (6.15ff). They had to be plainly told by St. Paul in what peril they were, and reminded that the Israelites in the wilderness after the Exodus, who had committed just such sins as these, had lost their inheritance in the Promised Land (10.1-11). And what did St. James and the Jewish Christians think of such behaviour?

ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

(*a*) *The Gentile Mission*

That this is the Jewish-Christian Gospel is evident from the fact that the first and greatest of its five discourses, the Sermon on the Mount, is derived as regards the first half of it, 5.1 to 6.18, almost wholly from M, while 6.19 to 7.27 is nearly all from Q; and that in 15.24 the Lord's own mission, and in 10.5-6 that of the Twelve, are limited to 'the house of Israel'. We must however remember that this was the historical fact during the ministry; it is only in 10.23 that the same limitation is extended by implication to the later mission of the Church.

But the main emphasis of the Gospel is very different, and suggests strongly that the Gospel is written for the whole Church rather than for the Jewish-Christian part of it. The Gospel ends, 28.18, 20, with the command to the apostles to go and make disciples of all nations, baptising them and teaching them. The account of the Lord's active ministry ends in ch. 25 with the tremendous Parable of the Sheep and the Goats, in which all men, Christians, Jews and pagans, stand before the Son of Man in His glory, and all are judged by one standard: whether they have shown mercy to those in suffering and need, for in so doing or not doing they were doing it or not doing it to Him. Since the gathering of all the nations for the Judgment is pictured in the Sower-parables as the great Reaping, the prayer in 9.37-38 to the Lord of the Harvest to send labourers into His harvest (from Q) suggests the Gentile mission. There is explicit mention of the Gentile mission in 24.14 and 26.13 (both Marcan); from Mark, the evangelist takes the healing of the daughter of the Canaanite woman, 15.22-28, and from Q that of the Centurion's servant in 8.5-13, adding to it the

saying from elsewhere in Q about the coming of many from the east and west to sit down in the Kingdom of heaven, while the Jewish 'sons of the Kingdom' are cast into the outer darkness, vv. 11-12. Besides this, there is a whole series of passages where the coming in of the Gentiles is implied: in the coming of the Magi from the east to worship the new-born King, 2.1ff; in the prophecies in 4.16-17, mentioning 'Galilee of the Gentiles', and in 12.18-21, where the first of the Servant-poems is quoted in full, ending with the words 'and in his Name will the Gentiles hope' (following the LXX and not the Massoretic text). It is implied also in several parables: in 13.47ff, the Net cast into the sea and gathering fish of every kind; in the Wicked Husbandmen, 21.33-43 (Marcan), which in Matthew ends with the words 'The Kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation producing the fruits of it'; and in the Wedding-Feast, 22.1-14, where the command to the servants to go out into the thoroughfares and bring in all whom they find, must refer to the mission to the Gentiles and not to the publicans and sinners in Israel, since it comes after the allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem. Finally in 27.54, as in Mark, after the death of Jesus He is hailed as Son of God by the centurion and soldiers—a promise of many future Gentile conversions.

There is no narrow Jewish-Christian nationalism about this Gospel.

(*b*) *The Controversy about the Law and the Tradition*

It was said at the beginning of this paper that Matthew is most honest and careful in reproducing the sources which for him are authoritative, even when he cannot reconcile them. On the one side, there is 5.18-19: 'not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the Law, until all is accomplished (*heōs panta genētai*)' —and this last phrase must mean 'until the Last Day'; for it is 'until heaven and earth pass away', and so it cannot refer to the coming of Jesus to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, as v. 17 —and then, 'Whoever relaxes' (or 'looses', declares not to be binding) 'one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of heaven', v. 19. But is not this precisely what Jesus did, when according to Matthew as well as Mark He justified the action of His disciples

in plucking and eating ears of corn on the Sabbath, by citing David's action in eating the shewbread, contrary to the Law, and sharing it with His followers (Matt. 12.1-4)? Matthew reinforces this with two further points, in vv. 5-7.

In the case of the law of clean and unclean, Matthew is even more emphatic than Mark. He quotes the crucial saying in 15.11; but where Mark adds the comment that Jesus was thereby 'declaring all foods clean' (Mark 7.19), leaving the reader to understand that He had given the lead which the Church had followed in the Jewish-Christian controversy, Matthew goes on to say that the disciples said to Him that the Pharisees were scandalised by what He had said, and that He replied, vv. 13ff, 'Every plant which my heavenly Father has not planted will be rooted up', and that they were blind guides, and 'if the blind leads the blind, both will fall into a pit' (this last saying is from Q, cf. Luke 6.39, but not the application of it to this case). Such is the line taken by this Jewish-Christian Gospel. We may add that Romans 14.14, 'I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean of itself', implies that St. Paul also knew of the teaching of Jesus on this point, as the similar phrases in 1 Cor. 7.10, 12, 25 imply that in regard to marriage also he knew of the Lord's teaching and distinguished it from his own opinions on certain doubtful points.

With regard to the ordinance of marriage, Matthew is ambiguous. He follows Mark, as before, with regard to the original divine ordinance of marriage in Genesis 1.27 and 2.24 (for here it is a matter of an ordinance, not of a law), and the rejection of the law in Deut. 24.1 permitting the dissolution of marriage, as a concession to 'the hardness of your hearts' (19.4-8). On the other hand, there is an alteration in 19.3 of the question addressed to our Lord, so that it becomes the question whether Shammai's rigidity or Hillel's laxity is right; and there is the addition of the words 'except for fornication' in 19.9 and 'except on the ground of fornication' in 5.32, these words being absent from Luke 16.18 and presumably absent from Q. If 'fornication' were to be taken as meaning 'adultery', we should have here a ruling identical with Shammai's; if the word bears its proper meaning, it may refer to unchastity during betrothal, or possibly to incest; but this question cannot be discussed here. Our question is whether in this instance,

unlike the two previous ones, Matthew is pulled two ways by the testimony of Mark and by Jewish Christian usage following Shammai on this point. If so, it is another instance of conflict between his authorities, such as we have seen already in the conflict between 5.18-19 and the instances in which our Lord was reported as having revised the Law. We noted at the beginning of this paper a similar discrepancy between 23.1-3 and 15.1-9, on the authority for Christians of the tradition of the elders; on that point no more need be said here.

Another aspect of our Lord's controversy with the Pharisees is seen in His attitude to the tax-collectors and sinners. This is announced by Mark quite early in his narrative, in the call of Levi the tax-collector and the complaint against him at the meal in his house; this section ends with the saying, 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners' (Mark 2.14-17); but both the other evangelists give fuller treatment of this theme. The Marcan section just mentioned is fully reproduced in Matt. 9.9-13, and is amplified by the addition of the prophecy of Hosea, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice', which is quoted again with reference to the Sabbath in 12.7; in both cases the point is that the Pharisees have not understood the relation between ritual and real obedience to God. In addition, we have in Matthew the reviling of the Son of Man as the 'friend of publicans and sinners' (11.19, Q); the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, 20.1-16, where it is easy to identify the late-comers; and the parable of the Two Sons, 21.28-31, which leads up to the saying that 'the tax-collectors and the prostitutes go into the Kingdom of God before you', and then that these people listened to the righteous teaching of the Baptist and the Pharisees did not. Luke amplifies this theme in 7.36-50, in ch. 15 with its three great parables, and in the parable in 18.9-14 and in the call of Zacchaeus, 19.1-10.

In all this, Matthew is very faithful to the Gospel tradition as he has received it, even though there are discrepancies between his sources which he cannot reconcile. There is further the obvious parallel between the mission to the tax-collectors and sinners in Israel, and the later mission to the Gentiles.

(*c*) *Eschatology and Christology*

We noted at the beginning of this paper that in Matthew the

Kingdom of heaven is almost always seen as purely future; the disciples are continually being reminded of the coming Judgment. John the Baptist had conceived of the coming Kingdom in this way; and in Matt. 3.2 and 4.17 the Baptist's proclamation of it and our Lord's are set out in identical terms: 'Repent; for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand'; the Baptist's saying in 3.10b is reproduced in the same words in 7.19, and the substance of 3.9 in 7.21-23, where it is applied to the disciples. So also, the disciples are not described as 'the saints', or 'the righteous', 13.43, 49, 25.37, 46, or 'the blessed', *eulogēmenoi*, 25.34; these terms are here used of those who have passed through the Judgment, for 'many are called, but few are chosen', 22.14. We may contrast the use of the word *eklektoi*, 'chosen', in Luke 18.7, Rom. 8.33, 16.13, Col. 3.12, 1 Pet. 1.1, 2 John 1, and of the word 'saints' by St. Paul of the Christians, even those of Corinth; whereas in Matthew the word *hagioi* is used only of angels, 25.31, and departed saints, 27.52. Similarly in St. Paul the Christians are baptised into Christ's death, so as to be sharers even now in His resurrection-life, Rom. 6.2ff, and in Col. 3.1 he says, 'If then you are risen with Christ', even though this risen life of Christians in this world is a hidden life which will be 'manifested in glory' only when Christ appears at his Advent. The Spirit is given now, as the 'first fruits', Rom. 8.23, or 'first instalment', 2 Cor. 1.22, 5.5, of the future; and there is even now an 'adoption into sonship', Gal. 4.5, etc., which in 1 Peter and St. John becomes an actual 'new birth' to eternal life, 1 Pet. 1.23, John 3.5, etc. But in Matthew the 'new birth' is 'when the Son of man shall sit upon his throne of glory', 19.28, whereas the Lukan version of this saying probably refers to the spiritual authority of the apostles on earth, Luke 22.30. And in Matthew the nearest that we get to these descriptions of the new life of Christians 'in Christ' seems to be the description of the disciples as 'the salt of the earth', 'the light of the world', 'the city set on a hill' (5.13-16), where the warning is at once added that the salt may lose its savour, and that the disciples must let their light shine. Are we to say, then, that in Matthew there is a quite different theology from that of the main part of the New Testament? What do we say about this?

First: that in all the Gospels 'Not yet was (the gift of the)

Spirit, because Jesus was not yet glorified', John 7.39. During the ministry, our Lord's work was not yet done; even for Him, the glory of His Easter was still future. In this respect at least, the 'futurist' eschatology of Matthew is common to all the synoptists, and in part to St. John.

Second: that in Matthew there is indeed a parallel between the Baptist's ministry and His; but there is also a sharp contrast, which appears at once in the two prophecies of 3.3, the 'voice in the wilderness', and 4.15-16 where our Lord is described as the Light of the World. The Baptist is the Elijah of Mal. 4.5-6 in Matt. 11.7-15 (Q) and 17.10-13 (Mark); but Jesus is the Messiah (16.16, Mark) and the Son of the living God (ibid.), cf. 3.17 (Mark), 11.27 (Q), 17.5 (Mark) etc. It is further of interest to note that in the description of the Baptist Matthew carefully avoids saying that his baptism was 'for the remission of sins'. He keeps this phrase for use in its proper place: 'This is my blood of the Covenant, which is shed for (the) many[1] for the remission of sins' (26.28).

'The Son of man' is the title used, as in Mark, of His Advent in glory and of His passion, and of His earthly ministry as having power to forgive sins, 9.6, and as Lord of the Sabbath, 12.8; but its special meaning, for Matthew, seems to be His human lowliness. There are the two Q-sayings, that He 'has not where to lay his head', 8.20, and that He is reviled as a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, 11.19; and it is the thought of His lowliness as man that explains the question: 'Who do men say that the Son of man is?', 16.13—a phrase which would be impossible in Mark, for whom 'the Son of man' would be the answer to the question. It seems that it is this same thought that explains His answer in 3.15 to the Baptist's unwillingness to baptise Him; the answer is that, even though it is true that the Baptist will need the messianic baptism spoken of in 3.11, it is fitting that He should be baptised by him, because it is for Him 'to fulfil all righteousness' as the Interpreter of the Law of God both by His teaching and His example.[2]

In any study of a Jewish christology, we need to attend not only to the formal titles, but also to the way in which they are explained by what He says and does. Thus in 12.28 (Q), we

[1] 'The many', as meaning 'all mankind': Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, pp. 123-5.

[2] Bornkamm, pp. 245-6.

have: 'If I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then the Kingdom of God has arrived among you.' This saying implies an 'inaugurated eschatology' of a Kingdom already breaking in; and so does 11.5 (Q), with its very recognisable echo of Isa. 35.5-6, 'Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened', etc.; and again, the power of the Son of man to forgive sins, 9.6 (Mark), healing the paralytic in body and in soul. So, again, we have the word 'mercy', which in 23.23 appears in the trio of 'judgment, mercy and faith-faithfulness', which have priority over the keeping of the letter of the law. 'Mercy' is exemplified in the works of the Christ, when in 9.27-29 two blind men cry to Him, 'Have mercy upon us, thou Son of David'; they reply, 'Yes, Lord', and He touches their eyes and says, 'According to your faith be it done unto you.' This same petition comes again in 20.30-31, where it is from the parallel in Mark 10.47 (Bartimaeus), and in 15.22 (Matt. only, the Canaanite woman). Thus, while in 5.9 the merciful who forgive others and minister to them will be blessèd (*makarioi*) at the Last Day, in the healings which our Lord performs they are seen receiving mercy here and now. It is noteworthy that Matthew has no less than nine summaries of healings, in 4.23ff, 8.16-17 (Mark), 9.35, 12.15 (Mark), 14.14 and 35-36 (Mark), 15.30-31, 19.2, and 21.14, where Mark has only three. Here again, then, we have more examples of an 'inaugurated eschatology'.

Finally, there is Matthew's teaching about Church authority in 16.17-19 and 18.15-18. Here I will only repeat Bornkamm's observation,[1] that both these passages must be seen in the contexts in which our Evangelist inserts them. The Petrine text is inserted in a wholly Marcan section, Matt. 16.13-28, which contains Peter's confession, and then the Petrine text; then the first passion-prophecy, Peter's objection and the word to him: 'Get thee behind me, Satan!', the call to all the disciples to deny the self and carry the cross, and the word about the final Advent of the Son of man in glory to 'render to each man according to his works'—including all who exercise the ministry of stewardship and have authority to forbid and permit. The later passage, 18.15-18, comes within the Fourth Discourse of 18.1-35, which contains the disciples' question to him, 'Who is the greatest?', and His answer about humility, and receiving

[1] Bornkamm, pp. 256-9.

the little ones, and the terrible guilt of leading them into sin, and the preciousness of each little one in the Shepherd's eyes; and then the duty of forgiving others and the mighty parable of the man forgiven the debt of 10,000 talents, whose forgiveness is cancelled when he will not forgive others. Such is the context of the teaching about church discipline.

While, then, there is a certain difference of emphasis with regard to eschatology between this Gospel and most of the other New Testament books, the view held or formerly held by Bultmann that the Baptist and our Lord both proclaimed a purely 'future' Kingdom of God, is negated both by the evidence of His acts and words during the ministry and by the christology; and in regard to both these Matthew is in accord with the other evangelists.

To conclude: this gospel is plainly not a community-product in which the Jewish-Christians express a party view; rather, it is the work of an individual[1] writing for the Great Church, the Church Catholic, whose mission to all nations is very fully recognised, while at the same time he is anxious that the Church should not be deprived of the benefit of the moral and spiritual teaching in which he himself has been brought up. We may add that the Gospel according to Matthew has in fact been so received by the Church; if this was the purpose with which it was written, its aim was attained.

As for the Evangelist himself, it is idle to speculate under what circumstances he wrote his Gospel, in the disturbed conditions under which Jewish Christians lived after the Fall of Jerusalem. But this we can say: that the great carefulness and accuracy with which the Gospel is written, and the conscientiousness with which he preserves the traditions which he regards as authoritative, show what a labour of love the writing of the Gospel was; and that his constant emphasis on the future Judgment of all the disciples of Jesus according to their works indicates that he lived his own life, as he desired that his readers should live their lives, in a constant awareness of the Lord's presence.

[1] cf. Bornkamm, p. 259.

BOOK REVIEWS

Language, Logic and God. By FREDERICK FERRÉ. Harper, New York, 1961. Pp. 184. $3.50.

PROFESSOR Ferré has written a very useful book in lucid style which introduces the challenge presented to theologians by contemporary analytical philosophy. He has provided an excellent bibliography which should serve admirably those who wish to pursue further the problems raised in this book. Ferré exposes clearly the error of identifying logical positivism and the contemporary analytical movement in philosophy which displays a positive interest in the manifold ways in which language is actually used. He shows that there are good reasons internal to analytical philosophy itself for dissatisfaction with the logical positivism of an earlier day. The members of the so-called Vienna Circle, chiefly interested in the formal and the natural sciences, sought to propound a definition of meaning which set out the conditions that are satisfied by statements regarded as empirically informative. While it was not denied that language has other uses besides that of imparting factual information, nevertheless in practice a negative attitude was held toward the possibility of meaningful statements in the areas of metaphysics and theology.

Ferré indicates the significance of the later writings of Wittgenstein, who came to insist that we must break with the idea that language functions basically in one way and serves the same purpose. He might have made fuller reference to the work of such men as Ryle and Austin, who have been concerned with the development of techniques for the investigation of the use of language in various types of subject-matter. In his chapter on 'The Logic of Functional Analysis' the author shows how philosophical analysis seeks to understand various kinds of discourse by studying the principles for which it is used in its proper context. This chapter, one of the most significant in the book, might well have been amplified to show more fully how a logical apparatus, suitable to the analysis of discourse in subject-matter lying outside the range of mathematics and the natural sciences has been developed. This apparatus involves such principles as contextual implication and logical oddness.

The author puts some of the suggestions developed in his chapter on functional analysis to work in subsequent chapters which present three answers to the nature of theological language: the logic of analogy, the logic of obedience, and the logic of encounter. In his analysis of the logic of obedience Ferré charges Barth with a position

which 'instead of inspiring the human assaults and replaces it' (p. 89). This he terms 'logical docetism', a charge which minimises the way in which Barth's actual exegesis, as carried on in the *Dogmatik*, assists in providing criteria by which theological categories are explicated and judged. Ferré gives evidence of recognising this at other points in his essay (p. 93). Although Barth insists that God's revelation transcends the propositions of faith, he also argues that these propositions cannot be divorced from the words of Christ or from those propositions in which the primitive Church proclaimed its Lord. While Barth admits that theology has to affirm the unity of form and content in revelation, they must also be distinguished according to the principle of the *analogia fidei* (see *C.D.* I/2, pp. 471, 499). In other words, Barth, whom Ferré treats as an exponent of the 'logic of obedience', actually combines the ways of analogy and obedience; and when this is recognised some of Ferré's objections are overcome. Furthermore, Barth argues that the language of theology cannot, in *a priori* fashion, seek to determine the criterion by which divine revelation is established. Rather, this language grows out of the context in which the Word of God is acknowledged *a posteriori* by the claim which it makes on us. As regards theological propositions within Barth's system there is an 'open texture' in his assertions. He does not assume that we can exhaust the description of God because there is the possibility of emergence of new assertions in light of further investigation of the given data of Scripture and in the present revaluation of the past tradition within which Scripture has been thus far interpreted. Barth is genuinely concerned with the way in which theological propositions are to be established and verified in a manner appropriate to the subject-matter of theology itself. But there is an irreducible juridical element in his understanding of theological language, i.e. the assumption that God, as the proper referent of theological discourse, remains in the freedom of His activity steadfast and faithful in relation to the human words of Scripture and confession which have served to witness to His presence. Reference to Barth's book on Anselm, *Fides Quaerens Intellectum*, would have been useful in strengthening Ferré's analysis at this point.

In subsequent chapters, Ferré discusses philosophical arguments which purport to show that theological language is in various ways improper. Here he attempts to meet the philosophers on their own grounds and he does so in a judicious manner. He then turns to attempts of linguistic philosophers to justify theological discourse and he evaluates these attempts, arguing that there are distinctive features about the logic of theological language. He points out that full analysis of such language must take three forms: 'syntactics',

which analyses relationships between verbal signs themselves; 'interpretics', which analyses what words mean for those using them; and 'semantics', which inquires concerning the relationship between language and its referent. The author seeks to indicate the integral relation of these three forms if the concrete functioning of theological language is to be understood.

In the final pages of the book, Ferré states his own position and speaks of God as a model of 'great responsive depth found within human experience'. He seems to be saying that God and the language of faith belong together in such a way that the referent of theological statements cannot be understood independently of the responsive attitude and evaluation of the believer. He does speak of metaphysical 'facts', but he does not succeed in making clear the state of affairs to which such facts refer. Further, his statements about the facts of science as theories (p. 161) overlook the kinds of distinction introduced, for example, by Toulmin. The latter shows how the procedures used to establish the truth of facts, laws and theories in scientific investigation are of different sorts and that there are features of theories which are not confirmed by facts in the way in which laws are confirmed.

Finally, more emphasis needs to be laid upon the manner in which theological discourse is shaped by *historical* claims. Some theologians are evidencing an increasing interest in the presuppositions underlying the techniques of historical inquiry and the analysis of the logical character of statements in historical discourse. The work of such men as Walsh, Dray, and Gardiner, dealing with the problem of historical knowledge, has profound implications for theological method.

Ferré's book is a welcome contribution to the growing impact that the new Oxford movement in philosophy, with its various branches and interests, is destined to have on theological discourse. What we need now are some genuine cross-currents between the Oxonians and the continental theologians. D. L. Deegan

On the Eternal in Man. By Max Scheler, translated by Bernard Noble. S.C.M. Press, London, 1960. Pp. 480. 63s.

This was one of the most important studies in the philosophy of religion to appear in Germany in the years following the First War. It comprises five somewhat loosely connected parts. The first is an essay entitled 'Repentance and Rebirth', in which Scheler vigorously defends Repentance against its various detractors, and examines its positive value first in the 'natural' order and then in the framework of metaphysics and religion—where it is found to be one of the foremost among the experiences in which the mind can reach out to grasp the

idea of God and appreciate the supreme truth of the divine love. The second part, an essay on 'The Nature of Philosophy and the Moral Preconditions of Philosophical Knowledge', begins by asserting the autonomy of philosophy, goes on to examine the nature and conditions of the philosophical act and ends with a short account of the three 'fundamental self-evident insights'. The third section, entitled 'Problems of Religion', forms the real core of the book and is by far the longest part of it (running to 250 pages). Here Scheler rejects all attempts to identify religion and metaphysics, but also all dualistic views of their relationship, enunciating over against both what he calls his 'system of conformity'; and from there he goes on to work out his view of the divine nature and attributes and of the human 'religious act'. The book concludes with two addresses, which might in a sense be called examples of the practical application of the principles elaborated in the foregoing: one on 'Christian Love and the 20th Century', the other on 'The Reconstruction of European Culture'.

Scheler writes as a Roman Catholic, and the first indication we have of that is that his book now appears with a Foreword by a Jesuit (Professor August Brunner). But there are also other signs of it. One notices, for example, that he shares the common Roman misconception according to which Luther's view of justification means 'merely that God closes his eyes to guilt and "counts it not", while man lingers on in sin and guilt' (p. 49)—and indeed he can never refer to Luther at all except in terms of (usually mistaken) criticism. Presumably, too, it is a certain Roman bias that accounts for the startling bracketing together of 'the Greek *heimarmene*, the Mohammedan doctrine of God and the fearful errors of Calvin' (p. 224)—as also for the odd phrase 'Calvinism and other Protestant sects' (p. 393), and for a certain tendency to use the term 'Protestantism' to cover a multitude of faults. There are also, especially in the two concluding addresses, abundant positive indications of the author's Roman allegiance. Such things might lead us to expect good Roman Catholic teaching also in the body of the work. Often enough, too, that is what it appears to provide (and it was probably Scheler's intention that it should). But appearances are proverbially deceptive.

On the one hand we find most of the familiar features of the traditional view of God, though they may be approached and presented in less familiar ways. The approach is, in fact, *via* the phenomenological philosophy of Husserl, on the basis of which Scheler finds it possible to make metaphysics and religion go hand in hand. Thus for example the metaphysical proofs of God do not in fact *prove* anything at all, and can be effective only where there is

already a religious outlook. Yet religion cannot do without them either, for they are examples of a type of argument (Scheler calls it 'functionalisation of essential insight') which is of vital importance if it is to grow in understanding of its object. In adopting such views Scheler of course crosses swords with half the philosophers of the nineteenth century, and particularly with Kant. It would seem, indeed, that his aim all along the line is to refute the nineteenth century, to correct the Schoolmen, and to restate in modern terms what he takes to have been the view of Augustine and perhaps also of early Thomism.

The argument is impressive, if not always easy. Yet it also stirs a lingering chord of doubt as to whether the content is not also changing with the new dress. And the doubt is brought most sharply to a head when we come to the strange attack on Schleiermacher (pp. 284ff). It is strange not only in its violence, but still more because the five basic errors of which Schleiermacher is accused are plainly errors he never committed, and he must in fact have been very largely in agreement with the 'corrections' Scheler demands. Here it becomes specially plain that Scheler is far closer to Schleiermacher than he realises—that he is not after all a 'good Catholic', but rather represents a sort of Neo-catholicism parallel to the Neo-protestantism of the Schleiermacher tradition. In view of his avowed dissatisfaction with the nineteenth century, he may have to be placed well down the line—perhaps in the neighbourhood of Rudolf Otto, whom he admires in so many ways and who was certainly one of the heralds of the real break-away from the nineteenth century, if not indeed one of the earliest contributors to it. Yet he is not so near the border as Otto. And he is in constant danger of being dragged back. It may be worth adding here a biographical note that seems to confirm this. The fact is, that this book brought him into conflict with official Roman teaching. And this precipitated a crisis in his personal life so serious that he ultimately abandoned not only Catholicism but Christianity altogether and came to rest in something very near to the pantheism he had so long attacked.

Yet all this is not meant in a spirit of detraction. Indeed, it is precisely Scheler's ambivalence that makes him so intriguing. Basically, perhaps, he should now be seen chiefly as a warning. If his book is, as the jacket maintains, 'a classic in philosophical theology from the Germany which Hitler interrupted', then it also stands to show how the interruption was possible, not to say inevitable. It is the expression of a religious outlook whose contours are all too flat: God and man are neither far enough apart nor close enough together, sin is not black enough nor redemption sufficiently

glorious—or to put it otherwise, we are shown all the correct forms of God and man and their relationship, but they are dull and ghostly forms. There is little real drive and inspiration in it all (how disappointing that in his final chapter the most promising thing Scheler can see for the future of Europe in 1917 is only the hope of a possible alliance between 'Rome and Stockholm', i.e. the Catholic Church and the Socialist International!). Meantime, however, thought has moved on: existentialism has grown out of phenomenalism, while in theology the demolition of the nineteenth century has been completed and now a new generation (one thinks for example of Professor G. Ebeling in Zürich) is beginning to ask if there may not after all be something worth salvaging from the ruins. In all this Scheler's book puts the persistent question whether, and how far, we for our part have thereby succeeded in comprehending the breadth, and length, and depth, and height. . . . For the rest, it should be said that Scheler is an explosive thinker rather than a systematic one, and whatever his shortcomings may be from the systematic point of view, he does earn our gratitude for many individual insights of a profound and suggestive kind—and for some memorable phrases.

It remains to record our admiration for the patience and skill of the translator. He has not only provided a first-class translation, but has also added at vital points a number of notes which are always helpful, and often entertaining as well.

James W. Leitch

Le Christ et La Foi (Nouvelle série théologique, No. 10). By P. Vallotton. Labor et Fides, Geneva, 1960. Pp. 171.

There can be few Christians who would not subscribe to the intentions of this study, to emphasise the wholesome doctrine that Christian faith starts from and is wholly dependent upon God's creative initiative; and one can hardly be too often reminded of the insidious danger of treating faith as a 'work' of man which 'deserves' justification. All this is salutary; and, in the closing pages of this study, it is finely related to the mission of the Church and the cause of unity.

But the form in which this familiar and vital conviction is here stated is odd; and the exegesis by which the formulation is supported does not seem to stand up to scrutiny.

The formulation is undeniably striking. Not only faithfulness, we are told, but also faith belongs to God Himself: He believes in man—that is, He believes in the Man Christ Jesus, or in the image of God in man. And Christ Jesus also believes—believes in God and perfectly obeys Him. And our faith is, accordingly, Christ's faith or

God's faith operating in us. Thus: 'essentiellement, il nous semble que la foi peut être ainsi définie: DANS LES RAPPORTS DU CRÉATEUR ET DE SES CRÉATURES, LA FOI EST LA RECHERCHE ET L'ATTENTE ASSURÉES DU BIEN ET DE LA JUSTICE POUR L'ÊTRE AIMÉ ET DE SA PART. Une telle définition plus formelle que théologique contient le dénominateur commun de la *foi de Dieu*, de la *foi de Jésus-Christ*, et de *notre foi*' (98).

Now, if this purported to be no more than an arresting though unbiblical formulation of what the Bible expresses otherwise—that all is of God and that it is by God's grace in Christ that we are saved—it might be well enough. But the trouble begins when an attempt is made to extract the formula itself from the Bible. It involves too many non-sequiturs (the word 'donc' needs the most careful scrutiny). First, there are certain well-known facts: that the Hebrew of the Old Testament uses the same single root (*'mn*) for 'faithfulness' and 'faith', and that a Hebrew way of expressing 'to believe' is by the hiph'il of that root; and that in Greek πίστις may mean 'good faith', 'reliability', as well as 'faith'. There is undoubtedly much in common between 'faithfulness' and 'faith'; and the Bible certainly shows God's faithfulness as the sole ground of man's faith. It is significant, indeed, that the Hebrew root in question is often correctly rendered by ἀλήθεια: 'trust' and 'truth', 'faith' and 'faithfulness' are significantly allied in vocabulary as well as in fact, and no one would ask to question it.

But it does not follow that the distinction between 'faith' and 'faithfulness' should be ignored—a distinction of which writers in Hebrew and Greek were evidently well aware, even if some words in their vocabularies do duty both for 'fidélité' and 'foi'. To say that man's faith depends on God's *faithfulness* is biblical and intelligible. To say that it depends on God's *faith* is odd (and suddenly to say 'Dieu croit, il est fidèle', p. 111, is just bewildering). And there does not seem to be any connected argument to establish that, though odd, it is biblical.

Moreover, the exegetical fulcrum of the movement is the attempt (already made by others) to treat the phrase πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (see Rom. 3.22; Gal. 2.16, 20; 3.22; Phil. 3.9) as meaning primarily not 'faith in Jesus Christ' but 'the faith of Jesus Christ' (incidentally, a meaning which, even in New Testament Greek, would more naturally carry the definite article): primarily, for, to do Dr Vallotton justice, he does not, of course, wish to exclude other senses or to rule out man's part (see, for example p. 89). But, allowing that there are many overtones to a phrase which is undoubtedly rich and resonant, is it possible to sustain this case for even one meaning, let alone the dominant meaning, being that in

which Christ is subject? An obvious test is to ask: Where in the Bible is God or Christ the subject of a corresponding *verb*—'to trust' or 'to have faith'? And there seems to be no single instance of a verb thus used (Job comes only so near it as to say that God does *not* trust even His angels; and John 2.24 says that Jesus did *not* entrust Himself to men!). The whole case seems to depend on blurring and dogmatising: blurring faith and faithfulness ('le Dieu de foi de l'Ancien Testament', p. 151, in Dr Vallotton's sense of 'foi', is a figment, and cannot be made real by appeal to community of root or to the irrelevant fact that the hip'il is called a causative form); and a reiterated, dogmatic assertion (to call the exegesis of others dogmatic, p. 104, is to invite a *tu quoque*) that πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ means 'the faith of Jesus Christ' and that ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ (Mark 11.22) means 'avail yourselves of God's faith'.

As a matter of fact, the only place in the New Testament which might yield a plausible allusion to faith as exercised by Jesus is Heb. 12.2—and such plausibility as there is springs largely from the fact that this epistle in part presents the earthly life of Jesus as a heroic example to be strenuously copied. But that means that the only place where the New Testament comes near to Dr Vallotton's position is where it is furthest from his intentions, which are to steer as clear as possible of Pelagius. It is striking to say that God believes in man, and goes on believing till His faith, His creative faith, is vindicated in the perfect Man Christ Jesus, and that this is all the ground of our salvation and the sole basis of man's faith. But that is not how the New Testament in fact puts it; and it is almost pathetic to see the author again and again invoking that unique phrase ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ and trying to persuade himself that the cursing of the fig-tree (surely one of the least *creative* of the Gospel episodes) is in fact a great creative deed of God and a fitting context for this assertion about God's (creative) faith. Conversely, scant justice is done to evidence pointing in the other direction. So unmistakably credal a use of πίστις as 1 John 5.4ff, of the faith that conquers the world, is hurried over: 'nous ne voulons pas nous attarder sur la déclaration de I Jean 5:4s. . . . Nous nous contenterons de la rapprocher de la parole de Jésus . . . *Ayez bon courage, moi, j'ai vaincu le monde* . . .' (p. 127). And when we come to πιστεύειν εἰς, what happens? ' "Croire en Christ", cette expression ne signifie pas que Christ soit l'objet de notre foi—ils sont bien coupables, les grammairiens, de nous faire traiter Christ d'objet—mais que nous avons rencontré le Christ venu jusqu'à nous par son message salutaire . . .' (p. 133). Ma foi!

No: not one of these genitives of the divine after πίστις can be demonstrated to be subjective; and such evidence as is yielded by

the corresponding verbs is in the opposite sense. And it is extraordinary that Eph. 2.8 is almost ignored. This verse in fact perfectly safeguards the doctrinal position which is Dr Vallotton's concern, in common with all Christians, but does so without this word-juggling. Yet these decisive words, *τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον*, are quoted indeed, but do not seem to interest the writer particularly—any more than his splendid citations from Calvin and Luther, which say the same thing but are deemed inadequate because they do not say it with 'the faith of God' or 'of Christ'. And another significant fact seems to be missed—that justification (or corresponding terms) is very rarely coupled with *πίστις* in the *dative* as though faith were the agent, but rather with the *ἐκ* or *διά* of *means*.

It is disappointing that a book devout and full of zest carries so little substance. And the reader's discomfort is not lessened by frequent misprints and an obscurantist paragraph (p. 114f) which tries to press some Johannine arithmetic-symbolism into service. It would have been salutary, too, if, besides Trench and Hoskyns and Davey (almost the only English authors used), account had been taken of the brief but comprehensive note on the words in question by J. B. Lightfoot (on Galatians), and the valuable work of C. H. Dodd (e.g. in *The Bible and the Greeks*, pp. 66-70, and in *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 179-86). One reader at least, who set out thinking that now at last this thesis about 'the faith of Christ' would be decisively defended, finds himself more than ever 'enfermé dans le sens traditionnel donné au mot foi' (p. 117).

C. F. D. Moule

The Unchanging Gospel. By Edgar P. Dickie. St. Andrew Press, Edinburgh, 1960. Pp. 262. 7s. 6d.

This is the first of what the publishers (and not only they) hope will develop into a series of books having as their basis *A Short Statement of the Church's Faith* which was prepared by the committee under the Chairmanship of the late Professor H. R. Mackintosh of beloved memory 'to the ministers and members of the Church as an outline of the main articles of Christian people suitable for the instruction of learners and for the help and guidance of believers'. It takes the form of annotated Bible readings for daily devotion as commissioned by the General Assembly of 1955, and it had been hoped that the first volume would have been published in 1956. Through no fault of the author this was not to be, and for the reader it has certainly been well worth waiting for. It is good to think that this *Statement*, so well and lovingly prepared, is to be taken from the shelf on which

it has been too long left and given a new lease of life. And who better to start this than Professor Dickie?

For anything he writes is not only worth reading but readable. This volume has as its theme the first of the 'Statements': (1) God: There is one God Eternal and Almighty Creator, Upholder of all things, Father of all men; only Ruler and Judge of the world; Holy, righteous, wise and loving. Who will triumph in His glorious purpose over all evil.' Beginning with 'The Unchanging Gospel' Professor Dickie, in masterly fashion, gives a commentary on a Bible reading for every day of the year. His natural gift of making deep theological truths fresh, relevant, and intelligible, his brilliant, apt illustrations and typical flashes of humour makes this no ordinary book of annotated Bible readings, no ordinary book of devotion. It has the freshness of the St. Andrews breeze and will be a tremendous asset not only to those of us who are seeking to know more of the faith but also to those of us who are seeking to interpret it more clearly to others. For the busy minister it is a mine of suggestions for sermons and addresses, and for the busy layman it is a rich treasury as easily understood as it is carried. It is extremely well produced by the St. Andrew Press in a size that can fit into a pocket and be carried about not only to read in bed but also in the bus or the train. Pick this book up and open it where you will you will be helped, strengthened, and informed. It is just full of good things.

'In my boyhood', writes Dr Dickie in his Preface, ' "Daily Help for Daily Needs" was the title of brief meditations. In our time, a "Daily Help" means something rather different—though always comforting and often essential. May these studies be a daily handmaid to reflection on Christian themes throughout the year.' Well, they are, and will continue to be to one man at least.

For a long time people have been in debt to Professor Dickie for so many things, not least for himself, but surely this small book will put all into his debt further. It is the best book of its kind that I know.

RONALD SELBY WRIGHT

The Bible in the Age of Science. By ALAN RICHARDSON. S.C.M. Press, London, 1961. Pp. 186. 5s.

THE front cover of this S.C.M. paperback shows a photograph of the radio telescope at Jodrell Bank, but the photopgrah—like the title of the book—might give an inadequate impression of the contents of these Cadbury Lectures that were delivered in the University of Birmingham during 1961. The book is not concerned with the conflict between science and the Bible, but is about the revolution in scientific thinking that took place in the seventeenth century, the revolutions in historical and theological thinking that took place in

the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and the effect of these revolutions on our understanding and interpretation of the Bible. The author's contention is that the nineteenth-century revolution in human thinking sprang not so much from discoveries in the field of natural science as from the application of scientific historical method to the study of the Bible and of existentialist theology to its interpretation.

The book contains a brilliant survey of various theologies: From Schleiermacher to Barth; The Existentialist Theology; The *Heilsgeschichte* Theology; The Theology of Images—each of these is the title of a chapter—and in a final chapter on The Fulfilment of the Scriptures, both 'the theology of recital' and typology (safeguarded by being firmly rooted in history) are commended as means of understanding the Christian significance of the Bible. By these means the Old Testament can be shown to be a setting forth of God's plan of action for the redemption of mankind, and the New Testament the proclamation that the plan has been fulfilled in the 'pattern of birth, baptism, temptation, failure, death and resurrection'.

The number of names mentioned and of subjects touched upon is considerable—there are excellent indexes of both—and the book is informative and stimulating to a high degree.

CLIFFORD M. JONES

Rabbinic Theology. By ROY A. STEWART. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh and London, 1961. Pp. xvi + 202. 21s.

THIS unpretentious book is the product of much careful work, particularly in the selection of material. Its central themes are the Rabbinic views on the nature and manifestations of God, the Messiah, angels and demons, creation, sin, the afterlife, human nature. No rigid framework is imposed on Rabbinic thought, and the author digresses to illustrate the attitudes adopted in his sources towards, for example, the Scriptures, women, Melchizedek. A foreword by one of the Jewish faith, Raphael Loewe, assures us that the Christian author treats Rabbinism with fairness and appreciation. The opinions of the Rabbis are selected for their representativeness and for their interest for modern Christians and Jews. They are presented with lively explanation and comment. Where possible, technical language is avoided, and terms such as Halakhah are explained when introduced (however, on p. 4 it would have been wise to explain that Halakhoth is the plural). Much of the book would interest general readers even if they were neither Christians nor Jews. At the end there is an English translation of the Jewish daily prayers, a bibliography, and various indexes. Obvious and

harmless misprints occur in p. 49, l. 34; p. 80, l. 5; p. 100, n. 28; and p. 183, l. 7.

As an elementary introduction the book succeeds. It skilfully avoids impressionism, but as a result of its brevity it is too selective for scholarly purposes, and at times imprecise. Rabbinic statements about Torah and Wisdom as manifestations of God are mixed together (pp. 34-39), and the implication that the Rabbis sometimes expressed a Logos doctrine under that actual name (p. 37) can hardly be intended. It is inaccurate, too, to compare Job 34.14 and Eccles. 12.7 with the Greek notion of immortal spirit (p. 142f); in fact these passages could be regarded as quite opposite to the Greek notion, spirit being here something lent by God temporarily. The author consciously accepts other limitations too. He draws nearly all of his material from the Babylonian Talmud and the Midrash Rabbah. He mostly ignores the dating of opinions; an exception is his consideration of development in the Jewish attitude to Melchizedek possibly in reaction against Christianity (ch. IX). Some readers would like to know, for example, whether the extreme instances of anthropomorphism (pp. 25, 30, 31, 32) seem more characteristic of any particular period. Difficulties of interpretation are rarely discussed, though the variation in the meaning of the term Torah is examined briefly (p. 38). Comparison is limited to the Old Testament and the New Testament. Perhaps the NT comparisons should have been used for illustration only, and not for evaluation; for that the Christian Fathers are perhaps a fairer standard of comparison, since the Talmud has not the place in Judaism that the NT has in Christianity. However, in view of the recent emphasis on the Jewish background of the NT it is good to be reminded frequently (e.g. pp. 37, 49, 68, 79f, 116f) that Jewish thought may have been influenced by Christianity at least by way of reaction.

ALAN D. LOWE

The Synoptic Gospels. By JAMES HARDY ROPES. Oxford University Press, London, 1960. Pp. 117. 7s. 6d.

THIS book consists of lectures delivered by the famous American scholar shortly before his death in 1933 and published posthumously. Less widely known than they deserve to be, they are here reprinted with a preface by Professor D. E. Nineham. They are written in a clarity and simplicity of style matched by all the exactness of mature scholarship—no easy or common accomplishment. Their purpose is 'to look at each gospel for itself, as an individual book, the work, not merely of a compiler but of an author in the proper sense who tried to serve his generation with some kind of literary aim'. Professor Ropes anticipated current doubts about the source Q, which

he called 'a pure inference', and inclined towards the alternative view favoured by a number of scholars today, that Luke used Matthew. The book is thoroughly rewarding, and far more important than its slightness might suggest. In one respect, however, the author has been proved wrong. The Coptic Gospel of Thomas supplies reasons for the belief that there *were*, what Dr Ropes denied, other strands of tradition than those in our Gospels, which have been lost. A. J. B. Higgins

The Powers That Be. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 29. By Clinton D. Morrison. S.C.M. Press, London, 1960. Pp. 144. 9s. 6d.

This study of Romans 13.1-7, one of the most disputed passages in the Pauline writings, provides in the first part a survey and evaluation of recent interpretation, and in the second part an exegetical contribution which is claimed to be free of the deficiencies of its predecessors. The theory (perhaps most familiar in the form it takes in Cullmann's writings), which is subjected to careful and detailed scrutiny, is that the *exousiai* in Romans 13.1 are both the earthly rulers and the spiritual powers under whose authority they stand. These powers, although subjected to Christ, are allowed on the leash for the time being. Obedience to the state is therefore obligatory for Christians because, although unknowingly, it plays a part in God's redemptive plan. Dr Morrison next reviews the criticisms which have been levelled against this dual interpretation on linguistic, exegetical, historical, and dogmatic grounds. Nowhere else does Paul use the term *exousiai* in a dual sense.

The passage, it is argued, can only be properly understood as part of a 'communication', in which the meaning of *exousiai* would be familiar both to Paul and to the Roman Christians, because they belonged to the Graeco-Roman world. Paul is not telling the Romans anything new, for it was commonly accepted by both pagans and Jews, with their varying emphases, that obedience to the state was a religious duty. There is a long discussion of the Graeco-Roman conception of the state in the cosmos which, while perhaps somewhat disproportionately long, is justified by its purpose of showing how Christian converts inherited this type of thought. 'Underlying what Paul imparted concerning the *exousiai* is a point of view compounded of the contemporary concept of the State as amended by the distinctive faith in Christ' (p. 111). This faith marked off the Christians from all others in their attitude to the state. To them subjection to earthly rulers did not mean subjection to the spiritual powers, from which they were free in Christ.

The essential point of Dr Morrison's thesis is the distinction to be

drawn between the realm of Christ's lordship, which includes and always has included the spiritual powers, and 'the locus of his victory'—Christ's work had as its object not the spiritual powers, but the believer. It is hardly to be expected that this interpretation resolves all the difficulties where its predecessors have failed to do so. The cosmic aspect of the work of Christ almost disappears under the exigencies of the exegesis. But the book is a solid contribution of permanent value. One advantage of its approach is that it suggests an answer to the intractable problem of why the powers of this world remain virtually unaffected by Christ's work.

A. J. B. Higgins

Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. By Johannes Munck. S.C.M. Press, London, 1959. Pp. 351. 42s.

We welcome the appearance of an English translation of *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte* (Copenhagen, 1954), for it is a work as fascinating as it is important.

Professor Munck thinks that Pauline studies down to the present day have suffered under the persistent influence of the Tübingen school of last century; while the Tübingen dating of New Testament documents has been abandoned long ago, the Tübingen conception of a sharp conflict between Paul and the Church of Jerusalem has received wide acceptance. In his reaction against Tübingen and all its works, Professor Munck may indeed be accused of going too far in the other direction: he holds, for example, that the Judaisers in the Galatian churches were some of Paul's own Gentile converts, whose knowledge of the Church of Jerusalem was received from Paul himself; and argues that 'not only were there no factions, but there was also no Judaising in the church at Corinth at the time when Paul wrote his first letter to the Corinthians' (p. 167). When we recall that the first Tübingen manifesto was an essay by F. C. Baur on one of the factions at Corinth, we can appreciate how far Professor Munck has removed himself from that position!

But the most interesting feature in the book is the account which it gives of Paul's understanding of his apostolic task. He might well magnify his office as apostle to the Gentiles, for the evangelisation of the Gentiles had a crucial part to play in the salvation of mankind. According to Rom. 11.13ff the Gentiles' acceptance of the Gospel must precede its acceptance by all Israel, which would bring the history of salvation to its consummation. Professor Munck links this with Mark 13.10; before the consummation comes 'the gospel must first be preached to all nations'. Thus Paul, the chosen instrument for this work, is a figure of eschatological significance. This is emphasised by an extension of Professor Cullmann's identification

of the restrainer of 2 Thess. 2.6f with Paul himself, pursuing his Gentile mission, which must be completed before the events of the end-time take place. Once he had finished this work and presented 'the offering of the Gentiles' to God, the salvation of Israel and the Parousia would follow. The time was short: Paul's mission had to be finished within his lifetime. When he speaks of his work as ended in the regions between Jerusalem and Illyricum (Rom. 15.19-23), he does not mean that every individual in those parts had heard, much less believed, the Gospel; he means that the Gospel had been preached and churches planted in those regions. His universalism is a 'representative' universalism; we shall misjudge his procedure if we try to evaluate it in terms of modern missionary methods. And what he had done in the east he proposed to do in Spain and other western territories.

The character of Paul's life-mission is further underlined by the circumstances of his call to the apostleship. The three accounts of his call in Acts (chapters 9, 22, 26) and his own account in Gal. 1.15f show remarkable agreement in representing it as similar to the calls of various Old Testament prophets—men who filled significant roles in earlier stages of the history of salvation. But as 'a figure in redemptive history in the age of the Messiah' (p. 61) Paul surpasses the greatest men in Israel, not excluding Moses and Elijah. It is not surprising, then, that Professor Munck regards him as one of the two witnesses of Rev. 11, the other being Peter, apostle to the Jews as Paul was to the Gentiles. For, on Professor Munck's showing, both Peter and Paul are eschatologically significant figures.

With these principles to guide him, he surveys Paul's apostolic activity, using the leading Pauline epistles as his principal source. At many points he challenges commonly held beliefs, but usually with stronger arguments than that which leads him (in the absence of textual evidence) to excise the words 'of those who have believed' from Acts 21.20 (it was not members of the Church of Jerusalem, he thinks, but non-Christian Jews, that James wished Paul to conciliate). While one cannot go the whole way with him in his reaction against Tübingen, it is a pleasure to recognise that his presentation of Paul is worthy of the apostle's stature and achievement.

F. F. Bruce

Alpha and Omega. By S. H. Hooke. Nisbet, London, 1961. Pp. xvi + 304. 21s.

'The aim of this study,' writes the author in his concluding summary, 'has been to follow the course of God's search for a response from man which might serve as a starting point for his purpose of restoring the broken relationship between himself and man. It

assumes the possibility of communication between God and man, and this involves a study of the vocabulary of divine speech.' The vocabulary is found in images, and an image is defined as 'a mode of the divine speech by which the character and purpose of God can become visible and intelligible to men'. To go back to the opening sentence: 'This book is a study of the use of images as a mode of divine speech.' The study begins with Babylon and Egypt, since in each of these the author sees the elements of a response; but in each the response remained only partial. It was not in either of these great civilisations of the ancient world but in Israel that the true response was found. 'Something, of incontestable certainty, happened in the history of Israel which is without parallel in the history of any other people', and so the process was set in motion which was to find its climax, its fulfilment and its culmination in the revelation of Jesus Christ.

The book falls into four main parts. The first, devoted to the Old Testament pre-figurement, shows how the images emerged and developed out of the experience of the chosen people, and more particularly that of such figures as Abraham, Moses and the Prophets. Part II shows how all these threads of experience 'were gathered up into the experience of the Word Incarnate, and how in him all the images were transformed and illuminated'. Here attention is focused on the Synoptic account of the life and ministry of Jesus. The author is not unaware of the critical problems raised by the narrative, but 'underneath all questions of textual variants, source criticism and form-criticism, lies the ultimate fact that the gospels are the products of minds surrendered to the revelation of God in Christ, and moved, each according to his manner and measure of apprehension, to set forth the pattern of redemption'. An important element here, of course, is Jesus' own surrender of Himself to be the instrument of the Father's will, as evidenced in the stories of the Baptism and Temptation and throughout His ministry to its consummation on the Cross. Part III then passes to the Resurrection side of the Cross, to the new creation and the coming of the Spirit, while the fourth and final part is devoted to the fourfold exposition of the glory of the Son, the Petrine, the Pauline, the Johannine and that of the Auctor ad Hebraeos.

The approach is typological, but one object of the study is 'to discover some controlling principle which governs the selection of images, and the use of them as a mode of divine speech in the process of revelation. . . . If such a principle can be established, it should serve to prevent that uncontrolled use of typology which has brought the use of typology into so much disrepute of late.' It may be said at once that the attempt is on the whole successful. There

is none of that straining after types and swallowing of analogies which has occasioned the disrepute referred to. The images are shown to develop in the living experience of the Hebrew people, and then their fulfilment and transformation is made plain in Part II. Only at one point does there seem cause for question: in general a Moses typology may perhaps be accepted, but the attempt to correlate the three Matthean blocks of Jesus' teaching and the three blocks of the Mosaic Torah is to one reader at least rather unconvincing. But there are many acute suggestions for exegesis and interpretation: one, for example, which brings the Parable of the Leaven into line with the references to leaven elsewhere in the New Testament, as in the Old. 'The ultimate effect of leaven, if left to work unchecked, is corruption.'

Printing errors are commendably few: an occasional misplaced comma, a breathing substituted for an accent on pp. 151 and 257, a missing index at note 2 on p. 91; on p. 246 *Kyrios* is so spelt once, and twice *Kurios*, while on p. 36 a cross-reference refers to p. 36. A few other errors must be charged against the author: on p. 124 a translation of Gen. 1.2 is ascribed to Professor Meek, and criticised; on p. 206 it is ascribed to Goodspeed, and apparently accepted. On p. 199 some reference might have been made to the literature occasioned by Mlle Jaubert's theory, which has not gone without challenge, while on p. 244 there is no indication that the Kittel article *παῖς* is available in English in the S.C.M. Studies in Biblical Theology. On p. 223 the context seems to require the substitution of 'c.2' for c.5, while on p. 227 it is not at first sight entirely clear that note 1 refers to the Gospel of Luke and not to Acts.

These are, however, minor blemishes. The book as a whole is thoughtful and thought-provoking, and points a way to a fuller understanding of the importance of the Old Testament and its relation to the New. R. McL. Wilson

St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch (Yale Publications in Religion, I). By Virginia Corwin. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1960. Pp. xiv + 293. 40s.

In this, the first volume of a new series entitled *Yale Publications in Religion*, published under the direction of the Divinity School at Yale University, we have a contribution of major importance for the study of the sub-apostolic period. St. Ignatius of Antioch has been for a long time an enigmatic figure in patristic studies. Scholars with pet axes to grind have made use of his letters to support their own theories of Church and Ministry and of the relationship between orthodoxy and Gnosticism, while those who have sought primarily to discover his real place in the history of the development

of Christian doctrine have been hampered by the hiatus in our knowledge of early second-century Christianity.

The importance of Miss Corwin's contribution comes mainly from two facts. First, she has striven to listen to Ignatius himself without allowing preconceived theories to influence her interpretation, and, second, she has called into service the two recently discovered ancient libraries of the Dead Sea and Nag-Hammadi in order to illuminate the background of the Church in Antioch and Ignatius' letters. Part One, in which she establishes the background for her study of Ignatius' theology, is a valuable addition to the study of ancient Church history, in which, by and large, insufficient attention has been paid to the city of Antioch as the strategic centre for the spread of Christianity in Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia, standing as it did at a vital cross-roads of the Eastern Empire.

From Ignatius' letters Miss Corwin draws a clear picture of the situation in the Church at Antioch, analysing the three factions within the Church in the light of the recently discovered MSS. In opposition to Zahn, Lightfoot and Bultmann, who have argued that Ignatius faces only one group of false teachers, she finds two distinct groups of heretical teachers, (i) a group strongly influenced by the OT, 'who wished to see the Christian pattern become more strongly Jewish' (p. 52), a group which she clearly shows had affinities with 'a Judaism of an Essene character' (p. 64), and (ii) the Docetists, a group which she asserts were firmly entrenched in the Church, and not just a fringe group. (Concerning the latter, she says that they were only beginning to be a threat in Asia Minor; in view of the explicit anti-docetic emphasis of the pre-Ignatian First Epistle of John, this seems to be rather an understatement.) Miss Corwin goes on to demonstrate that the presence of these two theological factions made the Antioch Church 'fertile soil for the development of theology' (p. 54). She sets Ignatius as head of a middle-of-the-road party between the two extremes of right-wing Judaisers and left-wing Docetists.

This is the background against which she proceeds to study the theology of Ignatius. She lets Ignatius speak for himself, and strives to interpret Ignatius by Ignatius, showing, in doing so, a thorough familiarity with the Ignatian corpus, and a careful arrangement of the material. By placing his doctrine of the Church and Ministry in the setting of his whole theology she avoids the partial interpretations of those who study Ignatius only in order to bolster up their own particular doctrines. For this clear exposition of Ignatius' theology we must express our deep gratitude.

At some points it is difficult to follow Miss Corwin all the way in her interpretation of Ignatius' theology. To take but one point,

while she is correct in emphasising the importance of the concept of God's 'Word proceeding from Silence' (Magn. 8.2), it seems to be going too far to say that 'for Ignatius "Silence" seems to mean roughly what in more philosophical circles would be expressed by the metaphysical term *οὐσία*. . . . Silence is its equivalent' (p. 123). In view of the fact that Ignatius uses *ἡσυχία* in similar contexts, *σιγή* can hardly be considered to be a technical term for him, and wherever either term is used the context is explicitly concerned with revelation, which Miss Corwin aptly calls 'The Divine Event'. Ignatius may be groping for the idea which was to become central in later theology, but the introduction of the term *οὐσία* as the 'equivalent' of *σιγή* tempts us—and Miss Corwin succumbs to the temptation—to read into Ignatius' letters ideas which did not enter theology until much later.

Nevertheless Miss Corwin has given us a lucid and very readable book which makes a valuable addition to patristic scholarship, and Yale University Press is to be congratulated on an excellent beginning to a new series of volumes is presented in first-class format and beautiful binding.

A rather curious misprint or grammatical error occurs on p. 28, lines 12-13: 'that the expression Ignatius uses . . . are far better understood. . . .'

T. E. POLLARD

Tertullian: Treatise on Penance (Ancient Christian Writers, vol. xxviii). Translated and annotated by W. P. LE SAINT. Longmans Green, London, 1959. Pp. 330. 30s.

AT a time when an exciting adventure in mutual understanding is taking place on the part of Roman, Orthodox and Protestant scholars, fresh translations of the early Fathers, the rock whence we all were hewn, are particularly welcome. Dr Le Saint's translation of Tertullian's *De paenitentia* and *De pudicitia*, and more especially the copious and schollary commentary which occupies half of the volume, are a valuable contribution to the study of penitential discipline in the early Church.

Anyone who has tried to read Tertullian's Latin will know something of the difficulties which confront the translator. Dr Le Saint strives to overcome them by adopting a sound principle: 'In the interest of clarity and intelligibility difficult passages will be discussed in the notes; in the interest of impartiality the text will be translated as literally as possible' (p. 7). While striving to be literal, he has managed to produce an exceptionally readable translation.

There is one question which his translation raises, however. He points out the difficulty of translating the word *paenitentia*, which may mean 'penitence', 'repentance' and 'penance'. In his transla-

tion of the first (and earliest) of the two treatises, he uses all three words as translations of *paenitentia*, apparently relying on the context to guide him in his choice. Yet it is an interesting exercise to read the translation through, substituting either 'penitence' or 'repentance' wherever he has chosen to use 'penance'. Particularly in the earlier chapters, either would produce as clear a meaning as 'penance'. Of course, in the second treatise which was written when Tertullian had become a convinced Montanist and extremely critical of ecclesiastical laxity, the word *paenitentia* has come to have the more restricted meaning of our word 'penance'. Despite this, Dr Le Saint has, in his commentary, given us a most useful treatise of his own on the subject of penance, and both he and the editors of the series are to be congratulated on another excellent addition to what promises to be the major series of English translations of ancient writings.

T. E. POLLARD

The Ministry. By W. A. BRETHERTON. Church Book Room Press, 1961. Pp. 15. 9d.

THIS booklet, which is intended for 'intelligent lay people', examines the Scriptural origins and the nature and work of the Ministry. The writer distinguishes three factors in the development of 'apostolic succession'. (1) Evangelists succeeded apostles in founding churches. (2) Elders succeeded apostles in building churches up. (3) The Bible succeeded the apostles as the standard of truth. 'This last succession is the most important and regulates the other two. By the Word came life in the first place, and by a recovery of the Word can come new life when successions of men have become moribund (as in the Reformation and Wesleyan revival)' (p. 6).

It is noted that the Anglican Reformers retained the word 'priest' as an abbreviation of 'presbyter' hoping to rescue it from the sacrificial connotation which it had acquired in the Roman Church. They did not succeed. The ambiguity of the word has left scope for Anglo-Catholics to teach that the Ministry is a sacrificing priesthood. The word 'bishop' which was originally used of all presbyters came to be used exclusively of the president of the local group of presbyters after the death of the apostles. The view taken of episcopacy is that it may not have direct Scriptural authority, but it is to be accounted an institution which the Church early needed and still needs—one of those things which the Church can rightly develop for her well-being without repudiating the authoritative teaching of the Bible. It is in no way part of the essence of the Church so that without it a denomination cannot be a branch of the Church.

The saving grace of God is not limited to mediation through the

ministry of episcopally ordained priests who stand in direct tactual succession to the apostles. In the pre-Reformation Church at certain periods presbyters were permitted to ordain and to confirm. All ministry depends upon the authority of apostolic *doctrine* but this is mediated through the Bible. What ordination does is to give the seal of the Church's approval to those whom God has called to propagate Bible doctrine. Ordained ministers are essential to the Church's life only in the sense in which they provide a Scriptural and sensible way of organising church work.

The whole body of Christians is a priesthood called to offer sacrifices of self-dedication, praise and thanksgiving. This priestly work cannot be delegated to priests to be done by proxy. Christians must perform this for themselves. There is no place in the Church for an order of sacrificing priests.

This is a scholarly, plain-speaking pamphlet which is not ashamed to acclaim the Reformation heritage of the Anglican Church and to accept Holy Scripture as the supreme rule of faith. One wonders how widely its teaching is acceptable to Anglicans today, for its viewpoint holds out strong hope of mutual agreement between Anglicans and Presbyterians.

A. K. Robertson

Outward and Visible. By Basil Minchin. Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1961. Pp. 371. 21s.

This is the third volume in the series 'Worship in the Body of Christ', and it is marked by the same fresh and challenging spirit as its two predecessors. One may indeed wonder about the arrangement of subjects within the series. For instance, Part Two of the present volume deals with the 'details of the Eucharistic Action', but the discussion of the Ante-Communion is left over to the next volume, *Hearers and Doers of the Word.* However, each section as it comes is full of interest, and the completion of the series will no doubt justify the plan.

The first part of this volume, 'The House of God', deals with the architecture of the church building, emphasis being laid on the fact that the building must depend on the liturgy—its form must depend on its function. Here the architecture is treated historically and critically, and there are sixteen drawings which help in the understanding of the discussion. The author comes to the modern church, describing many new buildings both on the continent and in England and indicates his 'ideal for a modern church'. The building should be 'an extension of the Sarcament', and must speak to men of God. Much too is said of the furnishings of the church and there is a short and pertinent chapter on 'the clothes of the ministers'.

The second part deals with the eucharistic actions, and the five chapters take up as subjects, the behaviour of the laity, the great corporate acts in the Offertory and the Communion of the people, and the eucharistic actions of the President first in general and then during the Canon. Here again there is much historical information, but the history has as its end a re-examination of present-day practice.

In both parts the author poses many questions and offers his answers. Perhaps not all will agree with the answers, but they must reckon with them. On the whole his references to past practice are accurate, but he should be admonished that the Calvinists do not really 'reduce the "Consecration Prayer" to a bare recitation of the biblical account of the Insitituion' (p. 347). There are about a dozen printer's errors, but these will not lead the reader astray. There is a useful glossary, a list of 'conventions' in which words in common use but with overtones, are explained, and a good index. The book is vivacious and thought-provoking, and should not be missed by any who are interested in 'Worship in the Body of Christ'.

JOHN A. LAMB

Authority and Power in the Free Church Tradition. By PAUL M. HARRISON. Princeton University Press, Princeton; Oxford University Press, London; 1959. Pp. xix + 248. 40s.

CHURCHES with a congregational order of government do not find it easy to define precisely what power is to reside in their denominational organisation. The early Dissenters were agreed that the local churches were 'one in faith, fellowship and communion' and were eager for opportunities to give expression thereto, a policy implemented in the eighteenth century by the Associations which covered quite large areas. Yet so much depended on personal relationships. No system had been worked out which would safeguard their insights into the nature of the local church and at the same time meet the needs of an urbanised society for efficient nationwide co-operation, not least for furthering overseas missionary work.

Systems have gradually evolved. They are not yet what they need to be, though more satisfactory progress can perhaps be registered this side of the Atlantic where there has been a firmer building on the old Associations. Size has certainly made the American task exceedingly difficult.

In this volume an assistant professor at Princeton investigates the structure of the American Baptist Convention. It covers thirty-four State Conventions, has one and a half million members and over six thousand churches, all of which have the right to send at least one member to the Convention. If fellowship in the Gospel is

difficult to express in this organisation, how much more in the Southern Baptist Convention which is over five times larger.

Where does power reside in an organisation which is always putting forth programmes and raising vast sums for missions, evangelism and education? Professor Harrison employs down-to-earth sociological methods as he pursues the inquiry. Many are the tables, charts, diagrams, and references to Max Weber. Interviews with Convention officials, several of them very outspoken in criticism of the present set-up, are recorded. It is to the credit of the American Baptists that they themselves have appointed commissions of inquiry which are freely quoted.

Bureaucracy has triumphed over theology, says Dr Harrison. Organisation has been developed independently of the doctrine of the Church. The autonomy of the local church has for long been reckoned sacrosanct, but it is a secularisation of what the earliest Baptists had in mind. The Convention, which in theory is supposed to have no power over the local church, in practice dominates so much of its activity.

A democracy grounded in the Gospel was the original intention. It has been violated by large-scale organisation. A return to theological principles demands a suitable system of representation and the courage formally to assign to committees and officials authority, which is the right to exercise power. What is formally assigned can be withdrawn, if needs be. There is then a check on power.

Here is a survey which has relevance far beyond denominational frontiers.

K. C. Dykes

Backgrounds to Dispensationalism. By Clarence B. Bass. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1960. Pp. 184. $3.50.

A Scottish churchman who goes out to the North American continent to study trends in church life there soon realises that there is an almost morbid interest in dispensationalism. Unfortunately this question has engendered much divisiveness in American church life. Indeed it has been one of the greatest contributory factors in creating unbridgeable chasms between Christians today. The importance of this book, therefore, is that it shows why dispensationalism is such a live issue in the religious life of America.

The purpose of the book is to set dispensationalism within its historical context, analyse its main features, and expose its implications. The author's premise is that this system originated with John Nelson Darby in the nineteenth century, that it has little in common with historic premillenarianism, and is in fact a departure

from the apostolic faith. To support this thesis the author delineates the main features of dispensationalism, discusses Darby's character and his contribution to the system, and then offers an *exposé* of his cardinal doctrines of the Church and eschatology. The book ends with an inadequate evaluation of the system.

Dispensationalism divides history into a number of time periods. Each dispensation witnesses a change in the principles by which God tests men concerning their sin and responsibility. Since men fail when tested, each dispensation ends in judgment. Dispensationalism also teaches that biblical prophetic promises must be interpreted literally, that 'Israel' in the NT never includes Gentiles, and that the Abrahamic covenant must yet be fulfilled in every detail. For the dispensationalist God's covenant with Israel is the determinative factor in all His purposes in history. The covenants with Israel and the Church are entirely independent of each other. The Church was only a parenthesis in history not the continuation of God's redemptive purposes begun in Israel.

Dispensationalism views the Church as a hiatus, an after-thought, an interruption of God's plans for Israel caused by the latter's rejection of the kingdom offered to them by Christ. This kingdom would have been earthly, not spiritual, a literal fulfilment of God's promises to Abraham. Had Israel accepted it there would have been no Church! The Jews' rejection of the kingdom and of Jesus' Gospel of the kingdom rendered necessary the Gospel of grace revealed to Paul and the postponement of the kingdom. The latter will be offered to the Jews again at Christ's second advent but the Church will have no part in it whatsoever.

Dispensationalism also distinguishes between law and grace as two contrasting principles which determine men's relations with God in different dispensations. Law was the means of salvation from Exod. 20.1ff to Mal. 4.6, but from the crucifixion till the end of this present dispensation it is grace. Men are not redeemed in the same way in every dispensation. Dispensationalism also teaches that a rapture of the Church will precede a great tribulation. This idea stems not from an exegesis of 1 Thess. 4.16f but from the theory that the Church, being distinct from Israel, and having no part in the millennial Jewish kingdom, must be removed separately from the world before the tribulation out of which will come an elect remnant of Israel which will form the kingdom in the millennium. This millennial kingdom, literal in every sense, even to the rebuilding of the Temple and the reinstitution of the OT sacrificial system, is the consummation of God's redemptive purposes, not the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the dispensationalist the blessed hope is the rapture of a parenthetical Church dwelling eternally in the

'new Jerusalem'. It has no share in Christ's kingdom. That is entirely Jewish.

In the opinion of the thorough-going dispensationalists disagreement with this dispensational interpretation of Scripture signifies apostasy. Thus dispensationalism as a system is largely the theology of undenominational and independent groups in America, and has been fiercely resisted by the denominations who hold to a theology which reaches back through the Reformation to the historic and apostolic faith.

In his book Dr Bass then shows that dispensationalism originated with John Nelson Darby the high priest of the system. He describes the origins, developments and divisions of 'Plymouth Brethrenism' within which dispensationalism was born. Here much is made of the bitter controversies and sectarian spirit that divided Brethrenism into splinter groups, between which fellowship became, and still is, impossible. Not only did Darby father dispensationalism; he also left to Brethrenism a sad legacy of his own sectarian and separatist spirit. He it was who created the gulf between the Open and the Exclusive Brethren, the latter being dominated by him.

In these controversies Darby hammered out the principles of biblical interpretation upon which dispensationalism depends, and his view of the Church. In London, for example, each assembly was only a segment of the local Church, and could not act except in agreement with the other segments represented by the London Central Meeting which legislated on fellowship, finance, discipline, excommunication, relations with excommunicated assemblies, etc. Gradually the thorough-going dispensationalists became convinced that the test of a man's Christianity and suitability for fellowship was not the new birth, nor the apostolic faith, but acceptance of the dispensational interpretation of the Bible and submission to Church practice as observed by the Brethren. Refusal to accept this interpretation and practice makes separation necessary since for Darby unity in the Body of Christ depends upon separation from evil.

This principle of separation is still rigidly enforced today. Darby and his sect hold that the visible Church is apostate and 'in ruins'. This dispensation of the Church must therefore end in judgment as have the other dispensations. However, a remnant will be saved out of this judgment, and this remnant, the only true Church, is the Exclusive Brethren. Outside the believer-assembly is only apostasy. The Church came into existence at Pentecost. It is not a continuation of God's covenant with Israel but was a parenthesis necessitated by Israel's rejection of the kingdom offered by Christ.

John Darby's eschatology is rooted in two principles: his view of

the Church which stemmed from his dispensational division between Israel and the Church, and his rigid literalism in interpreting Scripture. The former was paramount to his total eschatological chronology, the special resurrection of the Church, its rapture and subsequent return with Christ, and the millennium when the Jewish kingdom, identical with that which Christ offered during his earthly ministry, will be established in literal fulfilment of the terms of the Abrahamic covenant.

Few will dispute that Dr Bass has established his thesis: that dispensationalism is a departure from the historic faith of the Church, and that as a theological aberration it originated with John Nelson Darby. It must be said, however, that Dr Bass does not argue that all sections of Brethrenism accept Darby's dispensationalism in its entirety or practise Darby's harsh sectarianism. All Brethren are not ultra-dispensationalists. Indeed the original split between the Open and the Exclusive Brethren was a protest against the extremes to which Darby the logician was prepared to push dispensationalism and apply his separatism. But the author is concerned to expose the implications of the system when worked out to its logical conclusion for the benefit of those who have never taken the trouble to do so for themselves.

The author has also placed in his debt those readers who have only the haziest notions of the assumptions and implications of theoretical dispensationalism. He has exposed the main features of the system with fairness, restraint and generosity, and has pointed out some of its serious weaknesses and errors. In his evaluation, however, he is content to do little more than observe that it is a departure from historic premillenarianism (which represents Dr Bass's own position) and from the apostolic faith. Within these narrow limits the book has achieved its aim, and many will be grateful to the author for his timely contribution toward an understanding of the problems and dangers inherent in dispensationalism so far as the Body of Christ is concerned.

J. G. S. S. Thomson

Lectures on Revivals of Religion. By Charles Grandison Finney, edited by W. G. McLaughlin. Harvard University Press and Oxford University Press, 1961. Pp. 470. 48s.

After having been put off by the picture of a revivalist tent on the dust cover, and, even more, by the frightening daguerreotype of Finney taken during his evangelistic tour of Britain in 1850 ('the Lord let me loose upon them in a wonderful manner') readers of this book may be agreeably surprised to find such restrained and helpful guidance for present-day evangelism.

The lectures are not so much detailed accounts of revivals and of the preparation necessary for them as an account of Christian spirituality which is both the cause and effect of revival within the Church. Thus, four whole lectures are concerned with prayer.

Finney spends a good deal of time combating the supine attitude that Calvininsm seems to have induced. It is not surprising that the foremost Calvinist journal in the United States, the *Biblical Reportory and Theological Review*, should have accused him of being a Pelagian, for so he was if it is Pelagian to revolt against the paralysing 'cannotism' whereby human beings can do nothing but wait God's good time before they can be converted. 'No doubt', Finney commented, 'more than five thousand millions have gone down to hell while the church has been dreaming and waiting for God to save them. . . . Religion is something to do not something to wait for.' That this fitted in well with the current note of political emancipation may have increased its attraction.

Finney's remarks on preaching are still worth reading. He has wise things to say about a colloquial style, illustrations from everyday life, repetition, gestures and the dangers of preaching from a script. 'Many are willing to hear plain and searching preaching so long as they can apply it all to others,' he writes, and we know what he means.

The intensely personal aim of the kind of evangelism Finney writes about is its weakness. Finney paid little attention to organised religion. 'No doubt there is a jubilee in hell every year about the time of the meeting of the General Assembly,' he wrote. He was prepared to attack publicly any local minister who withheld his co-operation, and the effect of his missions could easily wreck such church life as there was—and sometimes did. In that case, what about the follow-up? This pin-points the weakness of some evangelistic campaigns today, and is the reason for many people putting their faith in the continuing mission of the Church, and a revitalising of the Church from within, for, as a Christian farmer once said, 'You can't put live chickens under a dead hen.'

H. J. Hammerton

Vision and Achievement 1796-1956: A History of the Foreign Missions of the Churches united in the Church of Scotland. By Elizabeth G. K. Hewat. Thomas Nelson and Sons, Edinburgh, 1960. Pp. 308. 25s.

The Foreign Mission Committee commissioned Dr Hewat to write this history of work with which they are connected. The copyright is held by the same Committee. These two simple facts provide the answer to a question which several readers of the book have put to

me in recent weeks, viz. Why is there no section on the great Jewish missions of the Church of Scotland in Palestine (as it was), Egypt, Hungary and other places? As at present organised the overseas work of our Church is too departmentalised. It is only fair to say that steps are now being taken by the General Assembly to co-ordinate—and mabye some day integrate—the departments working abroad.

The Committee could not have turned to anybody better equipped in mind and heart than Dr Hewat. Herself a former missionary, a trained research worker with a doctorate from Edinburgh University, a friend and counsellor of many missionaries and a keen ecumenist—she was well placed to tackle this very difficult task. She has put the Churches in her debt for years to come. Her clear style, her unfailing sence of perspective, the telling use of well-chosen quotations and a declared Christian concern that is as hostile to sentimentality as it is to cynicism—these qualities combine to give us a record that meets the requirements of the historian and the ordinary Church member.

There is a characteristic Foreword by the late Dr John Baillie. Each 'field' gets a chapter at the end of which there is a serviceable bibliography. (In the nature of the circumstances many of the sources could not be primary; much important research has still to be mapped out, of course, let alone executed, as I am sure Dr Hewat would be the first to agree.) After the challenging Epilogue there is a most useful 'Table of Important Dates'. It is the kind of thing that some of us have been looking for for years! The Index is thorough and reliable.

I found the following of particular interest: the famous debate in the 1796 General Assembly; the treatment of the 1824 Assembly Act; Western India; Madras; Kaffraria; South Arabia; Japan and of course the areas where I have been working myself. I commend this book to the readers of this Journal.

KENNETH MACKENZIE

Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries. By JOACHIM JEREMIAS. S.C.M. Press, London, 1960. Pp. 104. 12s 6d.

One Lord, One Baptism. Interim report of the W.C.C. Commission on Faith and Order. S.C.M. Press, London, 1960. Pp. 71. 6s.

IN the first chapter of his book, Professor Jeremias discusses the baptism of children whose parents joined the Church during the earliest period of its history. On the basis of many parallels of terminology and outward ritual between the rules governing proselyte baptism and the appropriate passages in the New Testament and early Christian writings, '. . . it must be assumed that in the

question of infant baptism also, the Christian baptismal ritual corresponded to that of proselyte baptism, i.e. that with the admission of Gentiles to Christianity, children of every age, including infants, were baptised also. (39).

Chapter two deals with the baptism of children born to Christian parents in the earliest period. It can be argued from 1 Cor 7.14 that descent from a Christian parent renders the child 'holy' and therefore not in need of baptism (indeed, Jeremias adopted this position himself in the German edition of this book) but this argument would obviate the demand for baptism of the unbelieving wife or husband who later was converted.

Mark 10.13-16 and parallels are carefully examined and shown to contain words reminiscent of a baptismal setting, particularly κωλύειν and the mention of laying on of hands, which 'belongs to the ritual of baptism' (54).

The rest of the book traces infant baptism to the end of the fourth century, beinnning with the martyrdom of Polycarp (dated 167-8 and hence implying Polycarp's birth to be about A.D. 80) and concluding with the crisis which arose in the fourth century when the practice of delaying baptism as long as possible for fear of post-baptismal sin became a serious problem for a short time until the might of Augustine and the Synod of Carthage (418) finally secured the baptism of infants.

On the basis of so slender a summary, criticism of Jeremias' extensive researches and scholarly conclusions can only appear presumptuous—yet there are assumptions and omissions which cannot go unchallenged.

1. No one will deny that there are verbal and external similarities between the language of proselyte baptism and Christian initiation, but this does not warrant the assumption that theological parallelism must be there as well.

2. To assume (p. 39) that Col. 2.11-12 indicates that for Paul baptism has replaced circumcision and therefore authorises the baptism of infants is as unjustified as to assume that 1 Cor. 5.7-8 indicates that for Paul the Lord's Supper has replaced the passover, and therefore it should be celebrated only once a year.

3. The categorical statement in comment on Acts 2.38f, 'the children are not coming generations, but the sons and daughters of the hearers' (40), does not accord with the general OT use of the phrase nor with the views of most expositors of the passage.

4. Mark 10.13-16 surely cannot still be offered as serious evidence for infant baptism; even Paedobaptists have recently rejected it in favour of Romans 6 in their services; and to suppose that the phrase 'and he put his hands upon them' would serve as an added reminder

of baptism to the hearers because 'laying on of hands belongs to the ritual of baptism' is anomalous in the extreme.

5. Polycarp's famous last words, 'Eighty and six years have I served Him . . .' is the typical saying of a man grown old in God's service in any century, but it will not stand the pressure put upon it to imply that Polycarp was baptised as an infant in A.D. 80. Recently an elderly Christian said to me, 'He has never let me down in eighty-two years' but she was baptised at nineteen. The eighty-two years meant her lifetime, as most obviously did Polycarp's expression.

Three other points may be noted, as they are relevant to much present-day writing about baptism.

(*a*) Why is the baptism of our Lord so often ignored? We are beset by theories beginning with proselyte baptism, John's baptism, Jewish lustrations, the 'baptism of blood' on Calvary, etc., but surely the baptism of Jesus is a most significant point?

(*b*) It is fairly clear that the New Testament teaching about the meaning of baptism cannot be applied to infants without serious modification. We know that the NT is not perfectly consistent in all matters, but it is too much to postulate its complete acceptance of the *practice* of infant baptism—so complete as never to need explicit mention—and its presentation of a *theology* of baptism so utterly at variance with this supposed practice.

(*c*) While no one disputes the rise of infant baptism in the first four centuries, it might be argued that this was a result of the acceptance in many quarters of belief in baptismal regeneration. Once rebirth in baptism was believed to be *ex opere operato*, faith would become an optional extra or a vicarious adjunct and the gate to infant baptism would be wide open.

The W.C.C. interim report *One Lord, One Baptism* meets the first point (*a*) to the full; its basic theme is that the Church's unity is found in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ and in the unity of the Trinity, and that baptism must be understood in the light of the baptism, death and resurrection of our Lord. 'The Church is a community created by Christ, a community created by the Spirit. . . . Our task is to acknowledge the unity which exists already, the unity in Christ and in the Spirit' (9).

The first section, dealing with the Church, discusses the continuity and the gulf between the Old Israel, the nation, and the New Israel, the Church and examines some of the metaphors used of the Church in the NT. Of these the most expressive is the concept of the body, with the basic idea of the believer's life as life *in* and *with* Christ. This participation in Christ is begun through faith—'. . . faith refers to the entire ordering and opening of self to Jesus Christ

—therefore including hope, love, trust, obedience, humility and belief' (24).

It is by baptism that we are initiated into the Church, '. . . our baptism means that we, the many, are incorporated into him and become one with him and in him' (56). 'Baptism not merely looks toward but effects incorporation into Christ' (56). It is the starting-point of our participation in Him, although it must be remembered that the initiative is on his side. This participation means 'the re-constitution of human life' and 'being conformed to the pattern of his life' (59). 'Baptism and faith are inseparably joined in the New Testament . . .' (61) and '. . . any understanding or practice of baptism which separates or obscures their fundamental connection is untrue to New Testament witness' (63). 'In baptism the individual is constituted a member of the body of Christ' (66); 'to be baptised means to be called to the life of a servant' (67).

So a clear pattern emerges. The Church is the new Messianic community, within which the Christian finds his life. Initiation is by baptism which is the first step in the life of participation in and with Christ. Baptism demands faith (that 'entire ordering and opening of self to Jesus Christ').

This only throws into sharp relief the point made in (*b*) above. Given the NT concept of the Church and the Apostolic pattern of baptism—as this report gives—how can the current practice and understanding of infant baptism be made to fit without serious modification somewhere?

This book demands and deserves serious study. The only blatant error is in the title. For what the report makes very clear indeed is that in Christendom we have One Lord, Two Baptisms.

J. R. C. Perkin

The Eucharistic Memorial. Part I, The Old Testament; Part II, the New Testament. By Max Thurian. Lutterworth Press (Ecumenical Studies in Worship, Nos. 7 and 8), London, 1960, 1961. Pp. 117, 133. 9s. 6d., 12s. 6d.

These two volumes are a translation by J. G. Davies of *L'Eucharistie*, reviewed in this Journal in Vol. 13, p. 106. The Lutterworth Press are to be congratulated on making this work available to English readers in a translation which brings out very clearly the ideas and intentions of the author. There are two changes in this version. First, there is a very valuable note on pp. 84-85, which deals with the biblical use of the word 'Memorial'. Indeed three sentences may be quoted from it as a summary of much of the author's thesis. 'When it (the word "memorial") is applied to the Eucharist, the term means first of all the presence of the divine activity on behalf

of His people, as a recalling to the believer, and the presence before God of what He has done in the course of the history of salvation, as a recalling in praise and supplication. The term memorial also has a secondary meaning which refers to the sacrificial understanding of the Eucharist. It does not have this as its primary meaning, but when it is used of the Eucharist it shows how and in what sense it can be conceived as a sacrifice, i.e. only in the sense that it is an act of proclamation, a memorial before men and before God, a presence and an actualisation of the unique sacrifice of Christ.' The second change is in the test of the eucharistic prayer, to make it conform with that in *Eucharistie à Taizé*.

The salient features of these volumes have been already indicated in the above-mentioned review. The first part discusses the memorial in the Old Testament with reference to the sacrifices and feasts and worship generally. In the second part the three main problems faced are those of the Words of Christ at the Last Supper, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and of the Real Presence. Particular attention is paid to the Reformed theologians, but with emphasis throughout on the ecumenical approach, and on the Eucharist as the sacrament of unity.

To read these volumes is to be impressed not only by the deeply devotional spirit of the author, but also by his ability to express theological ideas clearly, and by his understanding of the practical difficulties that face the minister in his pastoral work, especially in connexion with the sacraments. It is to be hoped that this work will be read and studied widely by ministers of all denominations. It is invaluable both for teaching and for homiletical purposes.

JOHN A. LAMB

The Bible and the Liturgy, By JEAN DANIÉLOU, S.J. Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1960. Pp. 372. 42s.

THIS is a translation of the work issued by Les Editions du Cerf in 1951, under the title *Bible et Liturgie*. It claims to be 'an interpretation of the symbolism of Christian Worship according to the Fathers of the Church', and it gives particular attention to Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist, and to the Christian Year. The main concern is with the teaching of the Fathers rather than with the biblical sources themselves, so that it would appear that the title does not indicate very clearly what the contents really are. The author indeed says that the sacramental theology of the Fathers is a biblical theology, and that the Fathers are witnesses to the faith of primitive Christianity. But the reader might be well-advised to read first, or along with this book, Daniélou's earlier *Sacramentum Futuri*,

which contains a fuller discussion of the problems of the typological study of the Bible. That would make the arguments clearer.

The Fathers of the Church spent much time on the typology of the Scriptures, and here we have many references to and quotations from writers like Cyril of Jerusalem, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Ambrose, Pseudo-Dionysius, and many others. The catechetical works are given special attention. The author explains how the various writers used the types, and points out the different methods of interpretation. But the main emphasis is not on the personal theology of the Fathers, but on 'the apostolic tradition of which they are the witnesses and the depositaries'.

It is all interesting exegetically and theologically, but the writer's purpose is above all pastoral. He feels there is so much in the subject that can be of use in the instruction of the faithful in the meaning of the sacraments and their application to and influence on the whole Christian life. And whether the reader agrees with typological interpretation or not, he will find much fascinating and helpful material in this study of the Fathers. It is unfortunate that there are many misprints, especially in the bibliography, but there is an excellent index.

JOHN A. LAMB

BOOKS RECEIVED

David H. Adeney: *The Unchanging Commission.* A reappraisal of foreign missions and the Christian's responsibility. IVF. 4s.

A. O. Anderson (ed.); *Adomnan's Life of Columba.* Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., Edinburgh. 50s.

G. H. Anderson: *The Theology of the Christian Mission.* S.C.M. Press. Pp. 313 + bibliography and index. 35s.

Gustav Aulen: *The Faith of the Christian Church* (revised edition). S.C.M. Press. Pp. 393 + index. 40s.

L. J. Baggott: *A New Approach to the Colossians.* A. R. Mowbray. Pp. 143. 21s.

J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink. *S. Caecilii Cypriani Scripta Quaedam.* Daaen's Uitg. Mij. N.V. Bert Bakker. The Hague. Fl. 5.90.

Denis Baly: *Academic Illusion.* S.P.C.K. Pp. 179. 17s. 6d.

Karl Barth: *The Humanity of God.* Collins. Pp. 96. 12s. 6d.

W. Bieder: *Die Beruf"ng im Neuen Testament.* Zwingli Verlag, Zürich. Pp. 110. Sw.Fr. 15.80

Foro K. Brown: *The Fathers of the Victorians,* The Age of Wilberforce. Cambridge U.P. Pp. 569. 55s.

F. F. Bruce: *The Epistle to the Ephesians.* Pickering and Inglis. Pp. 140. 13s. 6d.

Emil Brunner: *I Believe in God.* Sermons on the Apostles' Creed. Lutterworth Press. Pp. 160. 12s. 6d.

Rudolf Bultmann and A. Weiser: *Faith.* Bible Key Words from G. Kittel's T.W.zN.T. A. and C. Black. Pp. 125. 12s. 6d.

N. K. Chadwick: *The Age of the Saints in the Early Celtic Church.* Oxford U. P. Pp. 166. 12s. 6d.

R. A. Cole: *The Gospel According to St. Mark.* An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Press. Pp. 263. 10s. 6d.

Oscar Cullmann: *Der Ursprung des Weinachtfestes.* Zwingli Verlag. Zürich-Stuggart. Pp. 39.

Eric D'Arcy: *Conscience and its Right to Freedom.* Sheed and Ward. Pp. 277. 10s. 6d. (paper-back).

Horton Davies: *Worship and Theology in England from Watts and Wesley to Maurice 1690-1850.* Princeton and Oxford University Presses. Pp. 315 + bibliography and indices. 42s.

Margaret Deanesly: *The Pre-Conquest Church in England.* A. and C. Black. Pp. 374. 38s.

Charles St Dessain: *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman.* Vol. XI. Littlemore to Rome. October 1845 to December 1846. Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., Edinburgh. Pp. 363. 63s.

H. W. Dobson: *The Christian Year. The Prayer-Book Collects with Epistles and Gospels* (as tr. by J. B. Phillips) Geoffrey Bles, London. Pp. 311. 18s.

Dupont-Sommer (tr. G. Vernes): *The Essene Writings from Qumran.* Basil Blackwell. Pp. 428. 45s.

J. H. Eaton: *Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah.* The Torch Bible Commentaries. S.C.M. Press. Pp. 159. 12s. 6d.

G. Ebeling (tr. R. G. Smith): *The Nature of Faith.* Collins. Pp. 191. 18s.

Walther Eichrodt: *Theology of the Old Testament,* Vol. I. S.C.M. Press. Pp. 520 + indices. 50s.

T. S. Garrett: *Christian Worship.* Oxford U.P. Pp. 181 + index. 15s.

Gordon L. Glegg: *The Christ of Science.* The Saint Andrew Press. Pp. 59. 7s. 6d.

Norman Goodall: *The Ecumenical Movement.* Oxford U.P. Pp. 182 + appendices and index. 18s.

Robert Grant: *Gnosticism.* Collins. Pp. 254. 25s.

Haenschen: *Die Botschaft des Thomas-Evangeliums.* Walter de Gruyter and Co., Berlin. Pp. 76. DM. 7.80.

Régis Jolivet: *Man and Metaphysics.* Burns and Oates. Pp. 144. 8s. 6d.

Edgar Jones: *Proverbs and Ecclesiastes*. The Torch Bible Commentaries. S.C.M. Press. Pp. 349. 18s.

O. R. Jones: *The Concept of Holiness*. George Allen and Unwin Ltd. Pp. 200. 21s.

Hans Küng: *The Council and Reunion*. Sheed and Ward. Pp. 307. 11s. 6d.

G. W. H. Lampe (ed.): *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford U.P. Fascicle 1. Pp. 288. 84s.

John Lawson: *A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers*. The Macmillan Coy. Pp. 334. $5.00.

Robert Leaney: *From Judaean Caves*. (The Pathfinder Series). The Religious Education Press, Wallington. Pp. 128. 8s.

Robert Leaney: *The Story of the Scrolls*. (The Pathfinder Series No. 15). The Religious Education Press, Wallington. Pp. 122 + indexes. Unpriced.

Barnabas Lindars: *New Testament Apologetic*. S.C.M. Press. Pp. 286 + indexes. 35s.

Kurt Lüthi: *Gott und das Böse*. Zwingli Verlag. Zürich. Pp. 296. Sw.Fr. 23.

Walter Luthi: *The Lord's Prayer*. Oliver and Boyd. Pp. 103. 12s. 6d.

Ross Mackenzie: *John Calvin's Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*. Oliver and Boyd. Pp. 433. 30s.

Robert Matheson: *The Philosophy of All Possible Revelation*. A Moral essay by a renowned Victorian thinker. Greenwich Book Publishers, New York (489 Fifth Avenue). Pp. 100. $2.50.

W. R. Matthews: *The Thirty-Nine Articles*. A Plea for a New Statement of the Christian Faith as understood by the Church of England. Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 39. 3s. 6d.

C. B. Moss: *The Thirty-Nine Articles Revised*. A. R. Mowbray. Pp. 37. 2s. 6d.

Lesslie Newbiggin: *Is Christ Divided? A Plea for Christian Unity in a Revolutionary Age*. W. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan). $1.25.

H. Richard Niebuhr: *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture*. Faber and Faber. Pp. 144. 18s.

J. C. O'Neill: *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*. S.P.C.K. Pp. 184. 25s.

John Osborne: *Luther*. A Play. Faber and Faber. Pp. 102. 10s. 6d.

A. M. Ramsey. *Christian Spirituality Today*. The Faith Press. Pp. 62. 5s.

Edmund Schlink: *Der Kommende Christus und die kirchlichen Traditionen*. Beiträge zum Geschpräch zwischen den getrennten Kirchen. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen. Pp. 276.

Glyn Simon: *Bishops*. The Faith Press. London. Pp. 142. 18s.

J. D. Smart: *The Interpretation of Scripture*. S.C.M. Press. Pp. 307 + bibliography and index. 35s.

J. R. W. Stott: *The Preacher's Portrait*. Some New Testament Word Studies. The Tyndale Press. Pp. 111. 5s. (paper-covers).

R. V. G. Tasker: *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. An Introduction and Commentary. The Tyndale Press. Pp. 265. 12s. 6d.

Abbé de Tourville: *Light and Life*. Notes and Letters on the Spiritual Life. Dacre Press. Pp. 143. 8s. 6d.

A. E. Waite: *The Holy Grail*. The Galahad Quest in the Arthurian Literature. University Books Inc. (1601 Jericho Turnpike, New Hyde Park, N.Y.). Pp. 624. $10.00.

James Walsh: *The Revelations of Divine Love of Julian of Norwich*. Burns and Oates. Pp. 210. 18s.

Vincent Wilkins: *From Limbo to Heaven*. Sheed and Ward. Pp. 145. 7s. (paperback).

M. D. R. Willink: *Lively Letters of St Paul*. (The Pathfinder Series No. 16.) The Religious Education Press, Wallington. Pp. 124 + indexes. 8s.

John Wilson: *Philosophy and Religion*. Oxford U.P. Pp. 117 + index. 12s. 6d.

Printed in Great Britain by ROBERT CUNNINGHAM AND SONS LTD., ALVA

INDEX OF AUTHORS

(The Indices have been compiled by the
Rev. Cameron Dinwoodie, M.A., Ph.D., Langholm)

	PAGE
Barbour, Rev. R. S.	
Review of L. Cerfaux: *The Four Gospels; an historical introduction*	303
Review of Dietrich Ritschl: *Christ our Life*	201
Review of R. McL. Wilson: *The Gnostic Problem*	212
Barr, Rev. Professor James	
Review of E. Jenni: *Die politischen Voraussagen der Propheten*	89
Barth, Professor Karl	
Karl Barth on His Theological Vocation	225
Berry, Rev. Ronald	
Death and Life in Christ	60
Boobyer, Dr G. H.	
Review of A. M. Hunter: *Interpreting the Parables*	211
Brink, Professor J. A. B. van den	
Bible and Biblical Theology in the Early Reformation	337
Bruce, Professor F. F.	
Review of Johannes Munck: *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*	427
Review of *The New English Bible: New Testament*	194
Bulloch, Rev. Dr James	
Review of John Kennedy: *Presbyterian Authority and Discipline*	322
Review of George Scott-Moncrieff: *The Mirror and the Cross: Scotland and the Catholic Faith*	328
Cameron, Rev. Dr James K.	
Review of Paul T. Fuhrmann: *An Introduction to the Great Creeds of the Church*	311
Campbell, Rev. J. C.	
Review of Georg Fohrer: *Züricher Bibelkommentare: Das Buch Jesaja 1 Band, Kap.1.23*	300
Cranfield, Rev. C. E. B.	
Review of John Sutherland: *Godly Upbringing: A Survey of Sunday Schools and Bible Classes in the Church of Scotland*	326
Cullmann, Professor Oscar	
Oscar Cullmann on His Theological Vocation	228
Cunliffe-Jones, Rev. Principal H.	
Review of Ian T. Ramsey: *Freedom and Immortality*	202
Review of E. J. Tinsley: *The Imitation of God in Christ*	80
Review of W. A. Whitehouse: *Order, Goodness, Glory*	79

PAGE

DEEGAN, Rev. Professor Daniel
The Christological Determinant in Barth's Doctrine of Creation 119
Review of Frederick Ferré: *Language, Logic and God* - - - 414
Review of John Knox: *Jesus Lord and Christ* - - - - 81

DUTHIE, Rev. Principal Charles S.
Ultimate Triumph - - - - - - - - - - - - 156

DYKES, K. C.
Review of Paul M. Harrison: *Authority and Power in the Free Church Tradition* - - - - - - - - - - - - 435

EHRLICH, Rev. Dr Rudolf J.
Review of Heinrich Suso Braun: *Jesus als Mensch* - - - 299
Review of Emil Brunner: *Die Christliche Lehre von der Kirche, vom Glauben und von der Vollendung. Dogmatik*, Band III - - - 295

EVANS, Rev. Canon E.
Review of Henry Chadwick: *The Circle and the Ellipse* - - - 103
Review of Keetje Rozemond: *La Christologie de Saint Jean Damascène* - - - - - - - - - - - - 105

FOLEY, Grover E.
The Catholic Critics of Karl Barth in Outline and Analysis - 136

FRASER, Rev. I. M.
The Apostles' Doctrine and Fellowship - - - - - - 270

GILMORE, Rev. A.
The Date and Significance of the Last Supper - - - - 256

GUNN, The late Rev. George S.
Review of Douglas N. Sargent: *The Making of a Missionary* - 329

HALL, Rev. Basil
Review of Olive J. Brose: *Church and Parliament. The Reshaping of the Church of England, 1828-1860* - - - - - - - 317

HAMMERTON, H. J.
Review of Charles Grandison Finney (ed. W. G. McLaughlin): *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* - - - - - - - - 439

HERBERT, Rev. Gabriel
The Problem of the Gospel According to Matthew - - - 403

HICK, Rev. Professor John H.
Necessary Being - - - - - - - - - - - - 353

HIGGINS, Rev. Dr A. J. B.
Review of Clinton D. Morrison: *The Powers That Be* - - - 426
Review of James Hardy Ropes: *The Synoptic Gospels* - - - 425

HOLLAND, Dr J. A. B.
Review of André Bénoît: *Saint Irénée: Introduction à l'étude de sa théologie* - - - - - - - - - - - - 312
Review of Lindsay Dewar: *The Holy Spirit and Christian Thought* 87

HUTCHISON, Rev. Harry
'Who Does He Think He is?' - - - - - - - - - 234

PAGE

JEANES, W. P.
Jonathan Edwards' Conception of Freedom of the Will - - 1

JONES, Clifford M.
Review of Alan Richardson: *The Bible in the Age of Science* - - 423

KATZ, Rev. Dr Peter
Review of Bonifatius Fischer: *Vetus Latina*; *Die Alkuin-Bibel* - 102

KNIGHT, Rev. Professor G. A. F.
Review of Daniel Lys: *Nèphèsh, Histoire de l'Âme dans la Révélation d'Israël, au sein des Religions Proche-Orientales* - - - - - 91

LAMB, Rev. Dr John A.
Review of A. Crogaert: *The Mass: A Liturgical Commentary* - - 331
Review of Irénée-Henri Dalmais: *The Eastern Liturgies* - - 108
Review of Jean Daniélou: *The Bible and the Liturgy* - - - 445
Review of Charles Davis: *Liturgy and Doctrine* - - - - 329
Review of Noële M. Denis-Boulet: *The Christian Calendar* - - 108
Review of S. J. P. van Dijk and J. Hazelden Walker: *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy* - - - - - - - - 331
Review of N. V. Gogol: *The Divine Liturgy of the Russian Orthodox Church* - - - - - - - - - - - - - 220
Review of W. Jardine Grisbrooke: *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* - - - - - - - 106
Review of Robert Leuenberger: *Das Magnificat. Eine evangelische Betrachtung des Lobsgesanges der Maria* - - - - - - 330
Review of Basil Minchin: *Outward and Visible* - - - - 434
Review of Robert N. Rodenmayer: *Thanks be to God* - - - 330
Review of Massey H. Shepherd: *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse* - - - - - - - - - - - - 329
Review of Max Thurian: *The Eucharistic Memorial* - - - 444

LEE, Rev. E. Kenneth
Review of Ronald S. Wallace: *The Gospel Miracles* - - - 211

LEITCH, Rev. Dr James W.
Review of Karl Barth: *Anselm: Fides quaerens intellectum* - - - 297
Review of Max Scheler (tr. Bernard Noble): *On the Eternal in Man* 416

LOUDEN, Rev. Dr R. Stuart
Review of John A. Mackay: *The Presbyterian Way of Life* - - 324

LOWE, Alan D.
Review of Roy A. Stewart: *Rabbinic Theology* - - - - 424

MACKENZIE, Rev. Kenneth
Review of A. C. Bouquet: *The Christian Faith and Non-Christian Religions* - - - - - - - - - - - - 108
Review of Professor James M. Clark and John V. Skinner (tr.) *Meister Eckhart, Selected Treatises and Sermons* - - - - 220
Review of Elizabeth G. K. Hewat: *Vision and Achievement 1796-1956: A History of the Foreign Missions of the Churches united in the Church of Scotland* - - - - - - - - - - - 440

PAGE

MAXWELL, Rev. Professor William D.
Review of Edgar H. Brookes: *The City of God and the Politics of Crisis* - 206
Review of D. R. Dendy: *The Use of Lights in Christian Worship* - 333
Review of Peter Hinchliff: *The South African Liturgy* - 105

MOIR, Rev. Dr Ian A.
Review of R. W. Muncey (ed.): *The New Testament Text of St. Ambrose* - 100

MOLE, Rev. John
Laymanship - 380

MOULE, Rev. C. F. D.
Review of P. Vallotton: *Le Christ et la Foi* - 419

NICHOLLS, Rev. Professor William
The Church and the Historical Jesus - 15
Review of F-J. Leenhardt: *Ceci est mon Corps* - 318
Review of E. L. Mascall: *Via Media* - 215

OWEN, Rev. H. P.
Review of David Cairns: *A Gospel Without Myth?* - 197
Review of Alf Corell: *Consummatum Est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John* - 99
Review of John Macquarrie: *The Scope of Demythologizing* - 197

PARKER, Rev. T. H. L.
Review of Georgia Harkness: *John Calvin: the Man and his Ethics* 299
Review of L. Smits: *Saint Augustin dans l'œuvre de Jean Calvin.* Vol. I, *Étude de critique littéraire*; Vol II, *Tables des références augustiniennes* (tr. *E. van Laetham*) - 203

PERKIN, J. R. C.
Review of Joachim Jeremias: *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries* - 441
Review of W. C. C. Commission on Faith and Order: *One Lord, One Baptism* - 441

PIPER, Professor Otto
Christian Baptism - 370

POLLARD, Rev. Dr T. E.
Review of Virginia Corwin: *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* 430
Review of W. P. Le Saint (tr. and ed.): *Tertullian: Treatise on Penance* - 432

ROBERTSON, Rev. Dr A. K.
Review of W. A. Bretherton: *The Ministry* - 433
Review of E. L. Kendall: *A Living Sacrifice—a Study in Reparation* 321

ROUTLEY, Rev. Dr Erik
Review of John Crew Tyler: *The Blind Seer: George Matheson* - 104

SAWYERR, Rev. Harry
The Marcan Framework - 279

PAGE

SHEPHERD, Rev. H. A.
Review of Walther von Loewenich: *Paul. His Life and Work* - 310

SNAITH, Rev. Principal Norman H.
Review of John Bright: *A History of Israel* - - - - - - 208
Review of Thorlief Boman (tr. Jules L. Moreau): *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek Thought* - - - - - - - - - 301

STEVENSON, F. R.
Architecture and Liturgy - - - - - - - - - - - 390

STEWART, Rev. Professor James S.
Review of C. E. B. Cranfield: *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* 94
Review of Walter Luthi: *St. John's Gospel: an Exposition* - - - 307

THOMAS, Rev. J. Heywood
Some Comments on Tillich's Doctrine of Creation - - - 113
Review of Austin Farrer: *The Freedom of the Will* - - - 77

THOMSON, Rev. Dr J. G. S. S.
Review of Clarence B. Bass: *Backgrounds to Dispensationalism* - 436

VIA, Rev. Professor Dan O.
Darkness, Christ, and the Church in the Fourth Gospel - - 172

WALKER, Rev. C. R.
Review of Tito Colliander: *The Way of the Ascetics* (tr. Katherine Ferré, ed. R. M. French) - - - - - - - - - 217
Review of Elizabeth Stopp (tr.): *St. Francis de Sales: Selected Letters* - - - - - - - - - - - - - 217

WALKER, Rev. Dr G. S. M.
Review of S. L. Greenslade: *The English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church* - - - - - - - - - - - 215

WASSMER, Rev. Professor Thomas A.
The Trinitarian Theology of Augustine and His Debt to Plotinus 248

WILSON, Rev. Dr R. McL.
Review of F. C. Grant: *The Gospels, their Origin and their Growth* 304
Review of Kendrick Grobel: *The Gospel of Truth* - - - - 96
Review of A. J. B. Higgins: *The Historicity of the Fourth Gospel* - 309
Review of S. H. Hooke: *Alpha and Omega* - - - - - 428

WRIGHT, Rev. Dr Ronald Selby
Review of Edgar P. Dickie: *The Unchanging Gospel* - - - 422

YOUNG, Rev. William G.
The Holy Spirit and the Word of God - - - - - - 34

INDEX OF BOOKS

PAGE

Karl Barth: *Anselm: Fides quaerens intellectum* - - - - - 297
Clarence B. Bass: *Backgrounds to Dispensationalism* - - - - 436
André Bénoît: *Saint Irénée: Introduction à l'étude de sa théologie* - - 312
Thorlief Boman (tr. Jules L. Moreau): *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek Thought* - - - - - - - - - - - - 301
A. C. Bouquet: *The Christian Faith and Non-Christian Religions* - - 108
Heinrich Suso Braun: *Jesus als Mensch* - - - - - - - - 299
W. A. Bretherton: *The Ministry* - - - - - - - - - 433
John Bright: *A History of Israel* - - - - - - - - - 208
Edgar H. Brookes: *The City of God and the Politics of Crisis* - - - 206
Olive J. Brose: *Church and Parliament. The Reshaping of the Church of England, 1828-1860* - - - - - - - - - - - 317
Emil Brunner: *Die Christliche Lehre von der Kirche, vom Glauben und von der Vollendung. Dogmatik*, Band III - - - - - - - 295
David Cairns: *A Gospel Without Myth?* - - - - - - - - 197
L. Cerfaux: *The Four Gospels: an historical introduction* - - - - 303
Henry Chadwick: *The Circle and the Ellipse* - - - - - - - 103
Professor James M. Clark and John V. Skinner (tr.): *Meister Eckhart, Selected Treatises and Sermons* - - - - - - - - - 220
Tito Colliander: *The Way of the Ascetics* (tr. Katherine Ferré, ed. R. M. French) - - - - - - - - - - - - - 217
Alf Corell: *Consummatum Est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John* - - - - - - - - - - - - - 99
Virginia Corwin: *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* - - - 430
C. E. B. Cranfield: *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* - - - 94
A. Crogaert: *The Mass: A Liturgical Commentary* - - - - - 331
Irénée-Henri Dalmais: *The Eastern Liturgies* - - - - - 108
Jean Daniélou, S. J.: *The Bible and the Liturgy* - - - - - 445
Charles Davis: *Liturgy and Doctrine* - - - - - - - 329
D. R. Dendy: *The Use of Lights in Christian Worship* - - - - 333
Noële M. Denis-Boulet: *The Christian Calendar* - - - - - 108
Lindsay Dewar: *The Holy Spirit and Christian Thought* - - - - 87
Edgar P. Dickie: *The Unchanging Gospel* - - - - - - 422
S. J. P. van Dijk and J. Hazelden Walker: *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy* - - - - - - - - - - - - 331
Austin Farrer: *The Freedom of the Will* - - - - - - - 77
Frederick Ferré: *Language, Logic and God* - - - - - - 414
Charles Grandison Finney (ed. W. G. McLaughlin): *Lectures on Revivals in Religion* - - - - - - - - - - - 439
Bonifatius Fischer: *Vetus Latina*; *Die Alkuin-Bibel* - - - - 102
Georg Fohrer: *Züricher Bibelkommentare*: *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1 Band, Kap. 1.23 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 300

PAGE

Paul T. Fuhrmann: *An Introduction to the Great Creeds of the Church* - 311
N. V. Gogol: *The Divine Liturgy of the Russian Orthodox Church* - - 220
F. C. Grant: *The Gospels, their Origin and their Growth* - - - - 304
S. L. Greenslade: *The English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church* - 215
W. Jardine Grisbrooke: *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* - - - - - - - - - - 106
Kendrick Grobel: *The Gospel of Truth* - - - - - - - - 96
Georgia Harkness: *John Calvin: the Man and his Ethics* - - - 299
Paul M. Harrison: *Authority and Power in the Free Church Tradition* - 435
Elizabeth G. K. Hewat: *Vision and Achievement 1796-1956: A History of the Foreign Missions of the Churches united in the Church of Scotland* - 440
A. J. B. Higgins: *The Historicity of the Fourth Gospel* - - - - 309
Peter Hinchliff: *The South African Liturgy* - - - - - - 105
S. H. Hooke: *Alpha and Omega* - - - - - - - - 428
A. M. Hunter: *Interpreting the Parables* - - - - - - - 211
E. Jenni: *Die politischen Voraussagen der Propheten* - - - - - 89
Joachim Jeremias: *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries* - - - 441
E. L. Kendall: *A Living Sacrifice—A Study in Reparation* - - - 321
John Kennedy: *Presbyterian Authority and Discipline* - - - - 322
John Knox: *Jesus Lord and Christ* - - - - - - - - 81
F-J. Leenhardt: *Ceci est mon corps* - - - - - - - - 318
W. P. Le Saint (tr. and ed.): *Tertullian: Treatise on Penance* - - 432
Robert Leuenberger: *Das Magnificat. Eine evangelische Betrachtung des Lobgesanges der Maria* - - - - - - - - - - 330
Walter von Loewenich: *Paul. His Life and Work* - - - - - 310
Walther Lüthi: *St. John's Gospel: an Exposition* - - - - - 307
Daniel Lys: *Nèphèsh, Histoire de l'Ame dans la Révélation d'Israel, au sein des Religions Proche-Orientales* - - - - - - - - - 91
John A. Mackay: *The Presbyterian Way of Life* - - - - - 324
John Macquarrie: *The Scope of Demythologizing* - - - - - 197
E. L. Mascall: *Via Media* - - - - - - - - - - 215
Basil Minchin: *Outward and Visible* - - - - - - - - 434
Clinton D. Morrison: *The Powers That Be* - - - - - - 426
R. W. Muncey (ed.): *The New Testament Text of St. Ambrose* - - 100
Johannes Munck: *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* - - - - 427
The New English Bible: New Testament - - - - - - 194
Ian T. Ramsey: *Freedom and Immortality* - - - - - - 202
Alan Richardson: *The Bible in the Age of Science* - - - - - 423
Dietrich Ritschl: *Christ our Life* - - - - - - - - - 201
Robert N. Rodenmayer: *Thanks Be To God* - - - - - 330
James Hardy Ropes: *The Synoptic Gospels* - - - - - - 425
Keetje Rosemond: *La Christologie de Saint Jean Damascène* - - - 105
Douglas N. Sargent: *The Making of a Missionary* - - - - 329
Max Scheler (tr. Bernard Noble): *On the Eternal in Man* - - - 416
George Scott-Moncrieff: *The Mirror and the Cross: Scotland and the Catholic Faith* - - - - - - - - - - - - 328
Massey H. Shepherd: *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse* - - 329

PAGE

L. Smits: *Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin.* Vol. I, *Étude de critique littéraire;* Vol. II, *Tables des références augustiniennes* (trans. E. van Laetham) - - - - - - - - - - - 203
Roy A. Stewart: *Rabbinic Theology* - - - - - - - - 424
Elizabeth Stopp (tr.): *St. Francis de Sales: Selected Letters* - - - 217
John Sutherland: *Godly Upbringing: A Survey of Sunday Schools and Bible Classes in the Church of Scotland* - - - - - - - 326
Max Thurian: *The Eucharistic Memorial* - - - - - - - 444
E. J. Tinsley: *The Imitation of God in Christ* - - - - - - - 80
John Crew Tyler: *The Blind Seer: George Matheson* - - - - - 104
P. Vallotton: *Le Christ et La Foi* - - - - - - - - - 419
Ronald S. Wallace: *The Gospel Miracles* - - - - - - - 211
W. C. C. Commission on Faith and Order: *One Lord, One Baptism* 441
W. A. Whitehouse: *Order, Goodness, Glory* - - - - - - - 79
R. McL. Wilson: *The Gnostic Problem* - - - - - - - - 212

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Alkuin-Bibel, Die, 102
Alpha and Omega, 428
Ambrose, Saint, 100
Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, 106
Anglicanism, 215
Anselm, 356
Anselm: Fides quaerens intellectum, 297
Apostles' Doctrine and Fellowship, 270
Apostolic Succession, 272
Apostolate, 20
Aquinas, Thomas, 358
Architecture and Liturgy, 390
Asceticism, 217
Augustine, 203
  His debt to Plotinus, 248
  Theology of, 248
Authenticity of Bible, 52
Authority of Bible, 34
Authority and Power in the Free Church Tradition, 435

Background to Dispensationalism, 403
von Balthasar on Barth, 136
Baptism, 370, 441
Barth, Karl, 368
  Catholic Critics of, 136
  on Creation, 119
  Theological Vocation of, 225
  on Universalism, 164
Bible and the Liturgy, The, 445
Bible in the Age of Science, The, 423
Bible, Authenticity of, 52
  Authority of, 34
  Classes, 326
  in the Early Reformation, 337
Biblical Humanity, 349
Blind Seer: George Matheson, The, 104
van Bommel, Henry, 350
Bouillard on Barth, 145
Bultmann, 197

Calendar, The Christian, 108
Calvin, John, 299
  on Augustine, 203
Ceci est mon Corps, 318
Christ, Jesus, 126
  Death and Life in, 60
  as Judge, 234
  as Light of World, 172
  Self Witness of, 234
Christ et la Foi, Le, 419
Christ our Life, 201
Christian Baptism, 370
Christian Calendar, The, 108
Christian Faith and Non-Christian Religions, The, 108
Christliche Lehre von der Kirche, vom Glauben und von der Vollendung. Dogmatik, Die, Band III, 295
Christologie de Saint Jean Damascène, La., 105
Christology, 119, 188
  and Eschatology, 409
Church, 99, 434
  Doctrine of, 172
  Dogmatics, 226
  The Gentile, 404
  and the Historical Jesus, 15
  The Laity in the, 381
  and Ministry, 270
Church and Parliament: The Remaking of the Church of England 1828-1860, 317
Circle and the Ellipse, The, 103
City of God and the Politics of Crisis, The, 206
Comparative Religion, 108
Confirmation, 88
Consummatum Est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John, 99
Creation, Barth on, 119
  Tillich on, 113

Creeds, The Great, 311
Cullmann, Theological Vocation of, 228

Damascus, John of, 105
Darkness, Christ and the Church, 172
Death and Life in Christ, 60
Demythologising the New Testament, 197
Discipline, Presbyterian, 322
Divine Call, The, 370
Divine Liturgy of the Russian Orthodox Church, The, 220
Doctrine and Liturgy, 329
Dogmatics, 226, 232, 295

Eastern Liturgies, The, 108
Eckhart, Meister, 220
Edwards, Jonathan, on Freewill, 1
Ekklesia, 295
England, Church of, 317
English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church, The, 215
Episcopacy, 276
Eschatology, 99
and Christology, 409
Eucharistic Memorial, The, 444

Faith, 419
Farel, William, 341
Farmer, H. H. on Universalism, 161
Farrago omnium fere rerum theologicarum, 344
Fellowship in Fourth Gospel, 183
Findlay, J. N., 360
Four Gospels; an historical Introduction, The, 303
Fourth Gospel on the Church, 172
Fellowship in the, 183
Freedom of the Will, 1
Freedom and Immortality, 202
Freedom of the Will, The, 77
Fundamentalism, 40

Gentile Churches, 404
Gnostic Problem, The, 212
God, House of, 434
Imitation of, 80
Logic and, 414
Unity of, 248
Godly Upbringing: A Survey of Sunday Schools and Bible Classes in the Church of Scotland, 326
Gospel according to Saint Mark, The, 94
Gospel Miracles: Studies in Matthew, Mark and Luke, The, 211
Gospel of Truth, The, 96
Gospel Without Myth?, A, 197
Gospels, The Four, 303
Gospels, Synoptic, 425
Gospels, Their Origin and Their Growth, The, 304

Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek Thought, 301
Heidegger, 197
Historicity of the Fourth Gospel, The, 309
History of Israel, A, 208
Holy Spirit and Word of God, 34
Holy Spirit and Christian Thought, The, 88
Hope, The Message of, 373

Ignatius, St., 430
Imitation of God in Christ, The, 80
Immortality, 156, 202
Incarnation, 96, 124, 185
Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, 441
Interpreting the Parables, 211
Introduction to the Great Creeds of the Church, An, 311
Irenaeus, 312
Isaiah, 300
Israel, History of, 208

Jerusalem and Rome, 103
Jesus and the Church, 15
Jesus, Lord and Christ, 81
Jesus als Mensch, 299
John Calvin: The Man and His Ethics, 299
Judge, Christ as, 237

Küng on Barth, 141

Lambert, Francis, 344
Language, Logic and God, 414
Last Supper, Date and Significance of, 256
Law and Tradition, 407
Laymanship, 380
Lectures on Revivals of Religion, 439
Liberal Theology, 42
Life in Christ, 60
Light of World, Christ as, 172
Lights in Christian Worship, 333
Liturgy, 330, 331, 445
  Anglican, 106
Liturgy, and Architecture, 390
  Eastern, 108
  South African, 105
Liturgy and Doctrine, 329
Living Sacrifice—a Study in Reparation, A, 321
Logic and God, 414
Lord's Supper, 318, 444

Magnificat, Eine evangelische Betrachtung des Lobgesanges der Maria, Das, 330
Making of a Missionary, The, 329
Man, The Eternal in, 416
Man's Promise, 376
Marcan Framework, The, 279
Mark, Gospel of, 94
Mass, A Liturgical Commentary, The, 331
Matheson, George, 104
Matthew, Gospel of, 403
Meister Eckhart, Selected Treatises and Sermons, 220
Melanchthon, 340
Messiah, 82
Ministry, The, 433
Ministry in the Church, 270
  of the Laity, 388
  Meaning of the, 385
Miracles, 211
Mirror and the Cross: Scotland and the Catholic Faith, The, 328
Missionary, Making of a, 329
Missions, 440
Myth in the New Testament, 197

Necessary Being, 353
Neo-Calvinism, 44
Nèphèsh, Histoire de l'Âme dans la Révélation d'Israël, au sein des Religions Proche-Orientales, 91
New English Bible: New Testament, The, 194
New Testament, Myth in the, 197
New Testament Text of St. Ambrose, The, 100
Nineham on Mark's Gospel, 279

Old Latin, 102
On the Eternal in Man, 416
One Lord, One Baptism, 441
Order, Goodness, Glory, 79
Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy, The, 331
Outward and Visible, 434

Parables, The, 211
Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse, The, 329
Passover and Lord's Supper, 256
Patrick's Places, 339
Paul, His Life and Work, 310
Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, 427
Penance, 432
Plotinus and Augustine, 248
Plymouth Brethren, 438
Politics of Crisis, The, 206
politischen Voraussagen der Propheten, Die, 89
Power and Authority, 435
Powers That Be, The, 426
Presbyter, 433
Presbyterian Authority and Discipline, 322
Presbyterian Way of Life, The, 324
Promise, Man's, 376
Pugin, 398

Sacraments, 22
Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin, 203

St. Francis de Sales: Selected Letters, 217
St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch, 430
Saint Irénée: Introduction à l'étude de sa théologie, 312
St. John's Gospel: an Exposition, 307
St. Peter's, Rome, 398
Salvation, 427
Schleiermacher, 84
Science and the Bible, 423
Scope of Demythologizing, The, 197
Sinlessness of Christ, 235
Son of God, 238
Son of Man, 82, 241
Soul in the Old Testament, 91
South African Liturgy, The, 105
Spirit and the Word, The, 40
Summary of the divine Scriptures, 348
Sunday Schools, 326
Synoptic Gospels, 281
Synoptic Gospels, The, 425
Systematic Theology, 225

Tabernacle, 394
Tertullian: Treatise on Penance, 432
Thanks Be To God, 330
Tillich on Creation, 113
Tradition and Law, 407
Trinitarian Theology of Augustine, 248
Truth, Gospel of, 96

Ultimate Triumph, 156
Unchanging Gospel, The, 422
Unity of God, 248
Universalism, 156
Use of Lights in Christian Worship, The, 333

Vetus Latina, 102
Via Media, 215
Vision and Achievement 1796-1956: A History of the Foreign Missions of the Churches united in the Church of Scotland, 440
Volition, 6

Way of the Ascetics, The, 217
Who Does He Think He Is?, 234
Will, Freedom of the, 1, 77
Word of God, 22, 34
Word and Spirit, 40

Zurischer Bibelkommentare: Das Buch Jesaja, 1. Band, Kap. 1.23, 300